

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

115

CR-3083 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.09.2022

Ranjit Kaur and another

..Petitioners

Versus

State Bank of India

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. G.S.Verma, Advocate, for the petitioners.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

Through this revision petition, filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners assail the concurrent findings of fact arrived at by the courts below while dismissing their application under Order IX Rule 13 CPC to set aside the ex-parte judgement and decree dated 18.04.2012.

A suit for recovery filed by the respondent-Bank was decreed on 18.04.2012. There were two defendants i.e husband and the wife. The wife appeared through counsel but the husband never appeared. The counsel engaged by the wife also subsequently stopped appearing without any justifiable cause.

Both the courts, on appreciation of material, have found that the petitioners despite knowledge failed to contest the suit.

The learned counsel representing the petitioners, though, made sincere attempts, however, failed to draw the attention of the court to any perversity or substantive error in the order passed.

Hence, no ground to interfere is made out.

Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

September 07, 2022

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

nt

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