

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

Sr. No.109

CR-1432-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision : 17.01.2022

Sandeep Kumar

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

Manoj and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. K.S. Godara, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

Once again, a request for adjournment has been made on the ground that certain additional documents need to be placed on record.

The matter has been adjourned twice already. On the previous date of hearing, it has been noted that the matter was being adjourned to today finally.

It is, thus, obvious that learned counsel for the petitioner seeks an adjournment only for the purposes of keeping the case pending. The matter was first listed on 03.08.2021 and in case, certain relevant documents were required, they could have been obtained earlier.

The application for rejection of the petition filed by respondent No.1 was rejected. The Lok Adalat has rejected the said application by recording that both the parties are doing their business at Sirsa and the dispute relates to appointment of another distributor at Sirsa. The plea of lack of territorial jurisdiction has consequently been rejected.

No error has been pointed out in the said order and thus, the revision petition has no merit. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

17.01.2022

Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes/ No