

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

**Civil Revision No.389 of 2024
Date of Decision: 23.01.2024**

Suukhvinder Singh Lammba

...Revisionist-Petitioner

Versus

Charanjeet Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. S. K. Jain, Advocate,
for the revisionist-petitioner.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(ORAL)

By filing the instant revision-petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner-plaintiff (here-in-after to be referred as 'the plaintiff') has laid challenge to the order dated 03.01.2024 passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Chandigarh (for short 'the trial Court') whereby *Civil Suit No.177 of 2022* titled as "*Sukhvinder Singh Lammba vs. Charanjeet Singh*", has been adjourned to 01.02.2024 for consideration on the application, as moved by him under Order 23 Rule 1(c) CPC and he has also prayed for the issuance of direction to the trial Court to decide the above-referred application in a time bound manner, while averring that the said Court has already heard the arguments on the afore-said application but has again adjourned the matter for the same purpose.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner-plaintiff in the present revision-petition and have also perused the file carefully.

3. Concededly, the above-mentioned Civil Suit was filed in the year 2022 and the afore-said application had been moved by the plaintiff on 27.04.2023, as reflected in order Annexure P-4 passed by the trial Court. Further, as mentioned in order Annexure P-8, the defendant had filed Reply to the above-referred application on 17.08.2023 and a perusal of the orders Annexures P-9 to P-16, as passed by the trial Court thereafter, reveals that the matter has been adjourned from time to time because the arguments on the afore-said application were not advanced but the trial Court has been granting short adjournments for the said purpose. In these circumstances, no cogent ground for granting the relief, as sought in the instant petition, is made out.

4. As a sequel to the fore-going discussion, it follows that the present revision-petition is devoid of any merit and it being so, it deserves dismissal. Resultantly, the same stands dismissed accordingly.

23.01.2024
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether Reportable: No