

113

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

CRWP-2506-2022

Date of decision:22.03.2022

PREM CHAND GUPTA AND ANR

...Petitionera

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR

Present: Mr. Rohit Samhotra, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Pradeep Prakash Chahar, DAG, Haryana.

(Through Video Conferencing)

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

1. Earlier to the filing of the present petition, the petitioner had filed CRWP-7765-2021 before this Court. After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, upon the afore petition, this Court through an order made thereons, had proceeded to dispose of the above petition. The operative part of the afore made verdict, as, carried in paragraph 11 thereof, is extracted hereinafter.

“11. Keeping in view the above, the contentions as raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners, that yet there is a threat on the part of the co-respondent No.4, and, as arises from his making an entry into the relevant premises, for his interacting with his mother, who is residing in a specific portion of the relevant premises, becomes also amenable, for becoming not accepted by this Court.”

2. Subsequently, in the instant petition become canvassed rather reliefs, and, causes of action completely similar to the ones, as became earlier carried, in petition, bearing No.CRWP-7765-2021, titled '***P.C. Gupta and another Versus State of Haryana and others***' and, wherein the above extracted

operative part becomes carried. Consequently, when the instant petition obviously asks for granting of relief(s) similar to the ones, as became agitated earlier, and, also became rejected through the above extracted operative paragraph 11, carried in the verdict made by this Court, on 23.02.2022, upon, petition (supra). Therefore, the afore endeavour of the petitioners, to keep re-accessing Courts of law, for reliefs similar to the one, which became earlier agitated, and, which became denied through a verdict recorded earlier by this Court, cannot become countenanced by this Court, rather it is required to be deprecated, as the successive filings of petition, on same, and, similar causes of action, to the one, which became earlier canvassed, and, which became declined, renders the instant petition to become frivolously cast, and, also renders it, to become construed to be the grossest abuse of the process of Courts, and, the process of law.

3. Hence, it in the above facts, the petition is dismissed with exemplary costs of Rs.10,000/- to be forthwith deposited with the Treasurer of the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

22.03.2022

ithlesh

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
<i>Whether reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>