

[142] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-3349-2021

Date of Decision :16.12.2021

Gopi Chand and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Jatinder Sehgal and Ors.

....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present : Mr. Adarsh Jain, Advocate for the petitioners.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] At the outset, learned counsel contends that since the grievance of the petitioners pertains to interim injunction having been granted in favour of the respondent/counter-claimant/defendant No.5 but no decision having been taken on the applications for injunction filed by the petitioners/plaintiffs as well as the respondent/counter-claimant/defendant No.5 and more than two years having elapsed, the petitioners would be satisfied if the revision petition is disposed of by directing the learned trial Court to consider and decide the applications for injunction filed by the petitioners/plaintiffs as well as the respondent/counter-claimant/defendant No.5 in a time bound manner.

[2] In view of the nature of order proposed to be passed, there is no necessity to issue notice and seek response of the respondents. Accordingly, in the light of the position noted above, the revision petition is disposed of by granting liberty to the petitioners to move appropriate applications before the learned trial court for the applications for

counter-claimant/defendant No.5 to be decided in a time bound manner.

In case such applications are moved, the learned trial Court shall take steps to decide the applications for injunction filed by the petitioners as well as the respondent/counter-claimant/defendant No.5 in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible.

[3] Revision petition disposed of with the aforementioned directions.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

16.12.2021

'Amit'

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No.
Whether reportable : Yes/No.