

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION No 672 of 2000

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE K.A.PUJ

- =====
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed : NO
to see the judgements?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
 3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy : NO
of the judgement?
 4. Whether this case involves a substantial question : NO
of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution
of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
 5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned : NO
Magistrate/Magistrates, Judge/Judges, Tribunal/Tribunals?

SANAT MEHTA

Versus

HASMUKHLAL BHAGWANDAS

Appearance:

1. Civil Revision Application No. 672 of 2000
MR AR MAJMUDAR for Petitioner No. 1-7
MS KJ BRAHMBHATT for Respondent No. 1-8
DELETED for Respondent No. 5
NOTICE SERVED for Respondent No. 9
RULE NOT RECD BACK for Respondent No. 9
-

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE K.A.PUJ

Date of decision: 28/02/2003

ORAL JUDGEMENT

This matter is called out twice and yet neither the petitioner nor their advocate remained present. Ms.K.J.Brahmabhatt, the learned advocate for the respondent is present. The matter is argued at length earlier on two occasions. However, because the Court's time was over the matter could not be completed and was adjourned to today, i.e. 28-2-2003.

2) After considering the facts and evidence put before the Court as well as, after having heard the learned advocate appearing for the respective parties on earlier two occasions, I am of the view that no interference is called for in this order passed by the Hon'ble Small Causes Judge on application below exh.33 in Small Causes Suit No.172/1998 on 30th February, 2000, while exercising the revisional jurisdiction of this Court under Section 115 of the Civil Procedure Code. It cannot be said that while deciding the said application, the learned Small Causes Judge has committed any jurisdictional error. Since I do not find any substance or merit in the present Civil Revision Application the same is rejected with costs of Rs.2,000/-. Rule is discharged. Interim relief granted earlier stands vacated.

(K.A.Puj, J.)

/malek