

Present:
Mr. Justice Md. Iqbal Kabir

Civil Revision No. 2225 of 2013

IN THE MATTER OF:
An application under Section 115(1) of the Code of
Civil Procedure.

AND
IN THE MATTER OF:
Pintu and others

....Petitioners

Versus
Rangs Motors Limited on behalf of Manager, of
71/72 Puratan Elephant Road, Eastern Garden Red
Crescent Berek Tower, Sit No. 10, Police Station-
Ramna, District-Dhaka and others

....Opposite Parties

No one appears

....For both parties

Judgment on 08.12.2025.

This matter appears in the list for disposal. No one appears to press the
Rule.

However, on perusal of the record, it appears that at the instance of the
plaintiffs-petitioners, this Rule was issued in the following terms:

“Let a Rule be issued calling upon the opposite party No. 1 to
show cause as to why the impugned judgment and order dated
9.5.2013, passed by the learned Additional District Judge, 6th
Court, Dhaka, in Misc. Appeal No. 403 of 2010 affirming the order
dated 14.11.2010 passed by the learned Assistant Judge, 4th
Court, Dhaka in Title Suit No. 443 of 2010 rejecting the application
for temporary injunction should not be set aside and/or pass such
other or further order or orders as to this Court may seem fit and
proper.”

Further, it appears that at the time of the issuance of the Rule, this Court
passed an interim order in the following terms:

“Pending hearing of the Rule, let all further operation of the
impugned judgment and order dated 9.5.2013 passed by the
learned Additional District Judge, 6th Court, Dhaka in Misc. Appeal
No. 403 of 2010 be stayed for a period of 3(three) months on
condition the petitioners shall deposit enter outstanding dues

before the trial Court concerned within 3(three) months in default the Rule shall stand discharged.”

From the above-mentioned order, it appears that there was a default order, and that default order was failing to deposit the entire outstanding dues before the trial Court concerned within 3(three) months, the Rule shall stand discharged.

No one brings notice or apprises this Court about the present position of the case.

It appears that the Rule and interim order were passed on 14.07.2013; the petitioners of this case did not deposit the money pursuant to the order dated 14.07.2013. On that count, it appears the direction passed by this Court has not complied with. Therefore, the Rule issued by this Court has already become redundant, as there was a default order.

Accordingly, the Rule is discharged without any order as to cost.

The order of stay granted at the time of issuance of the Rule is hereby recalled and vacated.

Send a copy of this judgment and order to the concerned Court.