



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

(114)

CR-7395-2025

Date of Decision:-08.09.2025

HARBEL SINGH ALIAS HARVEL SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

SANDEEP SINGH JAMMU

... Respondent

(114.1)

HARBEL SINGH ALIAS HARVEL SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

RASHPAL SINGH JAMMU

... Respondent

-.-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Pranav Handa, Advocate, for
Mr. C.S. Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner
in both the petition(s).

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. These revision petitions have been filed against order dated 03.10.2023 passed by learned Civil Judge, Nakodar, vide which, the application under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC has been dismissed.

2. Briefly stated, the respondent/plaintiff filed a suit for damages on account of defamatory statements allegedly made by the petitioner on his channel BBC Gaonda, Punjab Radio Toronto Canada Channel, trending on Y.Tube Media on 27.05.2020. The petitioner filed the application on the ground that, since the interview was conducted in Toronto, Canada, the Court at Nakodar did not have territorial jurisdiction to try and entertain the suit. The application was contested by the plaintiff, and after hearing the arguments, the application was dismissed by the impugned order. The petitioner claims that the



dismissal of the application is patently wrong and the Court below has committed material illegality by exercising jurisdiction vested in it.

3. I have gone through the application as well as the impugned order.

4. In the impugned order, the learned Civil Judge has categorically mentioned that there are specific averments in the plaint stating that the interview was heard by the villagers and the plaintiff while residing in Village Tanda Ura, Tehsil Nakodar. It is well-settled law that applications under Order VII Rule 11 CPC are to be decided on the basis of the contents of the plaint alone. In the plaint, it is specifically stated that the interview was circulated in the village falling within the jurisdiction of the Nakodar Court and from the perusal of the impugned order, there is no illegality or material irregularity in exercising of the jurisdiction by the Court below, and as such, no interference is warranted.

5. In view of the above, the present revision petitions are dismissed, along with all pending miscellaneous applications, if any.

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

08.09.2025
S. Pathania

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