



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

121

CR No.3453 of 2025 (O&M)**Date of Decision :01.07.2025****Nikhil Singla****.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and others****..... Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL****Present : Mr. S.K.S.Bedi, Advocate for the petitioner.****VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (Oral):**

By way of the instant revision petition preferred under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner (Nikhil Singla) seeks issuance of directions to the Court of Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Ambala, to expeditiously decide the application under Order VII Rule 11 CPC filed on 18.03.2021 in Civil Suit No.1405/2020 titled as State of Haryana and another Vs. Nikhil Singla etc.

2. The case set up in the petition is that respondent No.2 through its Executive Officer filed a suit for declaration (Annexure P-1) to the effect that the award/decreed dated 08.12.2018, passed by the Presiding Officer-cum-Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), National Lok Adalat, Ambala in case No.CS/1006/2018 (Nikhil Singla Vs. Nirbhai Roadways Pvt. Ltd) was null & void, ineffective, illegal, arbitrary and obtained by defendant No.2 by misusing the process of law and concealment of facts qua the property bearing No.108, Railway Road, Ambala Cantt and was not binding upon the rights of plaintiffs and was, therefore, liable to be set aside. Consequential relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendants-petitioners from alienating, transferring, mortgaging or changing the nature of the property in dispute in any manner was also sought.



3. The grievance of the petitioner is that the respondents-plaintiffs No.1 and 2 are adopting delay tactics and they have been granted liberal and easy adjournments which is apparent from the interlocutory orders. The chronology of events has been given in the petition and it has been stated that the respondents-plaintiffs No.1 and 2 have abused the process of law to their advantage and to the disadvantage of the petitioner by seeking adjournment after adjournment.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has strenuously urged that on account of the delay tactics being adopted by the respondents-plaintiffs No.1 and 2, the decision in the application for rejection of plaint has been unreasonably delayed. Learned counsel has referred to the interlocutory orders. Learned counsel has submitted that justice has been denied to the petitioner as plaintiffs-respondents No.1 and 2 had taken more than 1 year and 4 months to file the reply to the application under Order VII Rule 11 which is now fixed for 03.07.2025 for arguments, therefore, the unreasonable delay caused in the decision of the suit has gravely prejudiced the rights and interest of the petitioner.

6. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

7. There would be no necessity of issuing notice to the respondents, for, in view of the nature of the order that is proposed to be passed, no prejudice would be caused to them.

8. The interlocutory orders show that the suit was presented on 19.10.2020 and notice to the petitioner was issued for 12.11.2020. The petitioner-defendant No.1 put in appearance through his counsel on 12.11.2020



and the case was adjourned to 15.12.2020. An application under Order VII Rule 11 CPC was moved on 18.03.2021 but the reply to the said application was filed on 25.07.2022. After that, the matter remained pending for arguments and decision of the said application and is now fixed for arguments in the application on 03.07.2025.

9. The aforesaid chronology of events shows that the decision in the application has been substantially delayed.

10. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances, as have been noticed in the preceding paragraphs, the present revision petition is disposed of with a direction to the Court concerned to finally dispose of the application under Order VII Rule 11 CPC, expeditiously and preferably within a period of two months from today.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

01.07.2025

Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No