



WEB COPY

C.R.P.No.4307 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.01.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

C.R.P.No.4307 of 2022

M/s.Jayasakthi Leathers (P) Ltd.,
Rep.by its Managing Director,
Mr.M.P.Adimoolam and its
Director Mrs.A.Alamelu,
No.13, MGR Street, Raman Nagar,
Lawspet Post, Puducherry – 605 008.

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.G.Ramesh
- 2.K.Saraswathi
- 3.The Managing Director,
Pondicherry Industrial Promotion and
Investment Corporation Limited,
(PIPDIC)
No.60, Romain Rolland Street,
Puducherry - 605 001.
- 4.K.Anuradha
- 5.S.M.R.Paper Cups Industries,
Represented by its Partner M.Veerasamy,
No.48, Louis Reddiar Thottam,
Marie Oulgaret,
Puducherry – 605 010.
- 6.The Union of India,
Rep.by its Chief Secretary,
Puducherry.



WEB COPY

7.The Chief Inspector of Factories and Boilers,
Puducherry.

8.The Director,
Department of Science Technology and Environment,
Puducherry.

9.The Member Secretary,
P.P.A., Puducherry.

10.The Commissioner,
Villianur Commune Panchayat,
Villianur, Puducherry.

11.The Director,
District Industry Centre,
Puducherry.

12.The Executive Engineer-IV,
Electricity Department (Main)
Puducherry.

13.Sig-Gen Technologies,
Rep.by its Proprietrix, Umadevi,
100, Lawspet, Puducherry – 605 008.

... Respondents

Prayer: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a direction to dispose of I.A.No.555 of 2022 in O.S.No.1457 of 2014 filed by the petitioner pending before the learned Principal District Munsif, Pondicherry within a limited time and speedy disposal interest of justice.



For Petitioner

: Mr.R.Arunkumar

WEB COPY

ORDER

The present Civil Revision Petition has been instituted to issue a direction to dispose of I.A.No.555 of 2022 in O.S.No.1457 of 2014 filed by the petitioner on the file of the learned Principal District Munsif, Pondicherry.

2. The revision petitioner is the plaintiff, who instituted a suit for permanent injunction. The suit is pending for the past about eight years. While so, he filed an Interlocutory Application for grant of *status quo*, which was not disposed of by the trial Court. The interim application filed after a lapse of about eight years from the institution of the suit itself is not entertainable, since the suit is ready for trial.

3. This Court is of the considered opinion that unnecessary adjournments on flimsy grounds would cause prejudice to the parties to the litigation. Rule is to conduct the case on the date it is posted for hearing. Adjournment is an exception. Thus, adjournments are to be granted only on



genuine grounds and even in such circumstances, on commencement of trial long adjournments are to be avoided. The reason is to be recorded by the Courts, if it is genuine.

4. Long pendency of litigations causing untold mental agony to the litigants are to be considered by the Courts concerned, while granting adjournments in a routine manner. Any party seeking adjournment on flimsy grounds or attempting to prolong and protract the case, then heavy cost is to be awarded, which is to be paid to the other party, who is ready to conduct the case. If such adjournments are frequently sought for, then exemplary or maximum costs are to be awarded by the Court concerned. The endeavour of the Court is to ensure that the cases are disposed of as expeditiously as possible by avoiding unnecessary adjournments.

5. The High Court cannot issue directions to the District Judiciary for speedy disposal of cases in a routine manner. Frequent directions if issued, the same cannot be a practical solution. The trust on the District Judiciary due to overburdening of litigation on Board is to be taken into consideration by the High Court. The routine directions for speedy disposal, if it is issued,



it would further cause unnecessary pressure on the District Judiciary. In many such cases, wherein directions are issued, the District Judiciary has come out with an administrative letter, seeking extension of time again and again and thus, the purpose for which such directions were issued by the High Court became defeated.

6. The longevity of the litigations are occurring at the instance of the parties on many occasions. The legal brains are adopting tactical approach to prolong and protract the cases for unjust gains and for Forum Shopping. Any party having an idea to achieve their goal in an indirect or illegal manner, then they are adopting all such tactics for the purpose of prolonging the case, which cannot be tolerated by the Courts. On some occasion, if any litigants feel that a particular Judicial Officer in the District Judiciary is inconvenient to them, they are seeking adjournments after adjournments or filing frivolous interlocutory applications through which they all are causing longevity to the litigation. Ill-motives of such litigants if allowed to succeed, then the same will result in miscarriage of justice and thus the Courts are expected to be cautious, while granting unnecessary adjournments on flimsy grounds. All such attempts should be thwarted by the Courts and the Court



WEB COPY

cannot aid such ill-motive of the parties. The frivolous and unnecessary interlocutory applications are to be dealt with in accordance with law and if the Court formed an opinion that such interlocutory applications are filed with an idea to prolong and protract the issues or filed with ill-motives, then the Court would not hesitate in awarding exemplary or maximum cost on such applications. The cases are to be disposed of in consistent manner to avoid unnecessary allegations and to redress the grievances of the parties approaching the Court of Law.

7. In the event of issuing direction in Civil Revision Petitions for speedy disposal without considering the number of cases pending in a particular Court on Board, it will result in discrimination against many other litigants, who all are waiting for disposal of their respective cases. There are allegations against the Courts that the cases are selectively picked up and disposed of. The plight of the poor and downtrodden are also to be taken into consideration, while disposing of the cases. The Court cannot provide any room for such feeling to the litigants. The trust on the Judicial System is the Hallmark and any form of favouritism or otherwise even in the matter of hearing of cases will have larger repercussions on the system. No doubt



certain cases are to be disposed of urgently if there is a public interest involved or the litigants are able to establish genuine urgency for early disposal of the cases. Such cases alone are to be given priority.

8. The practice of giving preference to any litigation without any justification at all circumstances to be avoided. Every litigant approaching the Court of Law is waiting for justice and thus, it must be done in a consistent manner and without discriminating the litigants. Therefore issuing directions indiscriminately for speedy disposal of cases by the District Judiciary would do no service to the cause of justice. The Court concerned is expected to regulate its own procedures in respect of the cases on Board for effective disposal and to ensure that the cases are disposed of within a reasonable period of time. However, the High Court cannot issue such directions for speedy disposal unless there is a justification or acceptable reason for issuing any such directions. Every urgency cannot be considered for issuing a direction for speedy disposal, the urgency, which is imminent to be considered.



WEB COPY

9. In the present case, the petitioner has not established any urgency or public interest or otherwise and therefore, this Court is not inclined to consider the relief as such sought for in the present Civil Revision Petition.

10. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed.

However, there shall be no order as to costs.

02.01.2023

kak

Index : Yes/No

Speaking order: Yes/No

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

To

1. The Principal District Munsif,
Pondicherry.

2. The Managing Director,
Pondicherry Industrial Promotion and
Investment Corporation Limited,
(PIPDIC)
No.60, Romain Rolland Street,
Puducherry - 605 001.

3. The Chief Secretary,
Union of India,
Puducherry.

4. The Chief Inspector of Factories and Boilers,
Puducherry.



5.The Director,
Department of Science Technology and Environment,
Puducherry.

6.The Member Secretary,
P.P.A., Puducherry.

7.The Commissioner,
Villianur Commune Panchayat,
Villianur, Puducherry.

8.The Director,
District Industry Centre,
Puducherry.

9.The Executive Engineer-IV,
Electricity Department (Main)
Puducherry.



WEB COPY

C.R.P.No.4307 of 2



S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

kak

C.R.P.No.4307 of 2022

02.01.2023