

Narotam Chand vs. Rakesh Kumar & another

Cr. Revision No. 139 of 2022

20.04.2023 Present: Mr.Panku Chaudhary, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.G.R. Palsra, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

Respondent No.1-Rakesh Kumar is present in person.

Mr.Rajesh Mandhotra, Additional Advocate General,  
for respondent No2-State.

Respondent No.1-Rakesh Kumar is present in person.

However, petitioner is not present.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has been informed by the petitioner today morning that because of ailment he was not able to come to Shimla. Therefore, he has prayed for another date for presence of parties.

Learned counsel for respondent No.1, under instructions, submits that respondent No.1 is ready for amicable settlement, but petitioner has neither approached him nor offered any amount for settlement.

In aforesaid facts and circumstances, matter is adjourned directing the petitioner to contact respondent No.1 well before next date of hearing for exploring possibility of amicable settlement and also to arrange amount, if any, settled between the parties for compromise. Petitioner shall remain present in person on next date of hearing. Respondent No.1 shall remain present only if petitioner contacts him and there is possibility of amicable settlement.

In case no settlement arrived at between the parties, petitioner shall also be liable to pay expenses of travelling etc. to respondent No.1, which he has incurred for attending the Court today, as petitioner has failed to contact as well as inform respondent No.1 about his inability to attend the Court despite the

fact that Village of the petitioner is situated at a distance of 3 kms  
from the place of respondent No.1.

List on 24.05.2023.

(Vivek Singh Thakur)  
Judge

April 20, 2023  
(Purohit)