



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

124

CR-3088-2024

Date of Decision: 27.01.2025

Harjeet Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

Iqbal Singh and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Ms. Surbhi Yadav, Advocate for
Mr. GS Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed by the present revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India read with Section 115 CPC, for setting aside the impugned order dated 12.02.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Additional District Judge, SAS Nagar (Mohali) and impugned order dated 17.11.2023 (Annexure P-2) passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Kharar, vide which the application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC for grant of *ad interim* injunction and appeal against the order dated 17.11.2023 was dismissed.

Perusal of the order-sheets reveals that the present civil revision was listed for hearing for 03 times i.e. on 20.05.2024, 07.08.2024 and 26.11.2024; and on every date, the same was adjourned at the request of learned counsel for the petitioner. On the last date of hearing i.e. 26.11.2024, when this case was listed for hearing, following order was passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court:-



“Learned counsel for the petitioner requests for an adjournment due to bereavement in the family of arguing counsel.

Although, today was the last opportunity but considering the grounds disclosed by learned counsel for the petitioner and in the interest of justice, adjourned to 27.01.2025.

Last opportunity stands intact.”

Today for the 4th time, yet another request for an adjournment has been made by learned proxy counsel appearing for the petitioner on the ground that learned arguing counsel is in some personal difficulty.

There is no justification to entertain the repeated requests for adjournment made by learned counsel for the petitioner on one pretext or the other. Therefore, it can safely be presumed that the petitioner or his counsel is not seriously interested in pursuing the instant revision petition. Thus, this Court is left with no other option except to dismiss the instant revision petition for non-prosecution.

Ordered accordingly.

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

27.01.2025
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes/No**

Whether Reportable **Yes/No**