



133

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

CR-7287-2024

Date of decision: 16.12.2024

Indian Bank

...Petitioner

Versus

Sunny Dahiya and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Krishnam Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a revision petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 03.09.2024 passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Gurugram in Civil Suit No.3265 of 2023 titled as “Sunny Dahiya and another Vs. Rajpal Dahiya and others” whereby an application dated 13.11.2023 for rejection of plaint under Order VII Rule 11 of CPC has not been decided.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has made a limited prayer in the present revision petition i.e., for expeditious disposal of application filed by the petitioner under Order VII Rule 11 CPC on 13.11.2023 (Annexure P-5). It is submitted that although in the order dated 14.11.2024, it has been mentioned that application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC has been filed by the petitioner-Bank but no such application has been filed by the petitioner-

bank and in fact, the petitioner-bank had filed reply to the application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC filed by the plaintiff. It is further submitted that the interim order is operating against the present petitioner-bank.

3. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present revision petition is disposed of with a request to the trial Court to decide the application filed under Order VII Rule 11 CPC on 13.11.2023 (Annexure P-5) as expeditiously as possible. Same would be subject to the statement made before this Court that the petitioner-bank has not filed any application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC and in case such an application is filed then the present revision petition would be deemed to have been dismissed.

16.12.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether reportable:-	Yes/No