

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Civil Revision No. 6917 of 2019

Date of Decision: 24.05.2022

Sarv Haryana Gramin Bank formerly known as Haryana Gramin Bank

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Desh Raj (Since Deceased) through his LRs and Another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Gaurav Khera, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. The suit filed by the bank was dismissed in default on 17.12.2013. The application filed for restoration of the suit, after a period of almost 27 months, has also been dismissed. The trial Court found that the petitioner has failed to furnish a sufficient cause for its non-appearance on the date fixed and also the reason of the inordinate delay of 27 months in filing the application for restoration of the suit. Even the first appeal filed by the bank has been dismissed.

2. The learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that the suit is for the recovery of public money. Be that as it may. The suit is for recovery of ₹2,09,116/-. The officials of the bank have been thoroughly negligent. The learned counsel representing the petitioner admits that no action against the employees of the bank has been taken, although they were negligent.

3. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, no ground is made out to interfere. Hence, the present revision petition is dismissed.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

May 24, 2022
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No