## IN THE HIGH COURT OF FIJI AT LAUTOKA CIVIL JURISDICTION

CIVIL ACITION NO. HBC 238 OF 2012

BETWEEN: SHAMENDRA K RAM of 31 Saru Back Road,

PLAINTIFF

Lautoka, Self, Employed and Farmer

AND : SEMISI TORA No 3 of Tore Sea Side Road, Lov.,

DEFENDANT

Lautoka, Landowner

Appearances: Plaintiff appeared in Person

Mr Nacolawa for the Defendant:

Date of Hearing: 20/02/2014

## Ruling

- 1] The Plaintiff by his interparte Notice of Motion dated 27<sup>th</sup> January 2014 is seeking the following orders
  - That the Defendant, Defendant's families, servants and agents to stay
    meters away from the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's farm and produce.
  - il) The Defendant, Defendant's families, servants and agents
    - a. To immediately remove the dangerous fire wood kitchen in the Plaintiff's farm
    - b. To cut/remove the mango trees unlarging to the PlaintIff's crops
    - c. To remove all the cassava plants from the Plaintiffs form and drains
    - d. To remove the electricity posts from the Plaintiff's boundary/driveway
    - e. Restrained from using the PlaintIff's driveway
    - f. Stop throwing and remove rubbish from the Plaintiff's farm
    - g. Rostrained from interfering with any AID agencies help to Plaintiff's farm
  - iii) The Restraining Order against the Defendant, families, and servants/agents be effective until the full and final determination of the whole case including any if Police case.

- iv) Costs of this application be paid by the Defendant
- Police to assist in serving, assist in execution and monitoring of this Order
- The Plaintiff has filed an affidavit sworn on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2014 in support of the said interparte Notice of Motion.
- 3] When this matter was taken up on the 30<sup>th</sup> January 2014 defendant was granted a date to file an affidavit in opposition to the Plaintiffs application.
- 4] On 20<sup>th</sup> of February 2014 when this matter was called Courisel for the defendant made oral submissions and said that this matter had been struck out and they have appealed against the said Order. He prayed Court to strike out the Plaintiffs application with cost as this matter no more before this Court.
- 5] The Plaintiff made submissions in roply and stated that this matter has not been struck out and that a default judgement has been entered in his favour. He stated that he is steeking the Orders in terms of the interparte Motion filed by him.
- 6] The Court granted a date for both parties to file written submission on this issue and the submissions have been filed accordingly.
- 7] In the submission filed on behalf of the defendant it is admitted that due to non appearance of the defendant or his Counsel a default judgement has been entered on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2013.
- 8] It is stated on the said submissions that the case is very much alive and application applied for their mistake in informing Court that the matter is no more before the Court.
- 9] As regard the present Application of the Plaintiff it is stated in the said submissions that very order the Plaintiff is seeking is already in place as Justice Nawanas Order was extended to 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2014 when the matter was called before the Master on 7<sup>th</sup> January 2014.
- 10] I will now refer to the Orders of Justice Nawana dated 26<sup>th</sup> November 2012. The Orders are as follows:
  - i) <u>THAT</u> an injunction restraining Order that the Defendant, families, anci/or their servants and/or their agents to stay 500 meters away from the Plaintiff, Plaintiff servants and agent and Plaintiff's farm and produce.

- THAT The Plaintiff to pay \$8,000.00 [eight thousand dollars] to the Deputy Registrar of the High Court.
- THAT The Restraining order is granted only until 5<sup>th</sup> December 2012.
- iv) THAT The Defendant to file the Reply and Statement of Defende of objection on or before 5<sup>th</sup> December 2012.
- THAT, The Plaintiff to file reply within 7 days thereafter.
- THAT the matter is adjourned to 5<sup>th</sup> December 2012 bofore the Master.
- The restraining order granted until 5<sup>th</sup> December 2012 has been extended until 18<sup>th</sup> February 2013 and not extended thereafter.
- On 24<sup>th</sup> January 2014 the Plaintiff has filed an Exparte Notice of Motion seeking an order to extend the restraining Order made by Justice Nawana until 7<sup>th</sup> February 2014.
- 13. When this Exparte Notice of Motion was forwarded to me by the registry I have made the following Order in Chamber.
  - "The injunction granted has lapsed. Therefore Extension cannot be granted. File fresh application and move"
- 14. Consequent to my order the plaintiff has filled the above mentioned interparte Notice of Motion dated 27<sup>th</sup> January 2014 supported by an affidavit seeking restraining orders against the defendant.
- 15. The 1<sup>st</sup> Restraining order sought by the Plaintiff in the present Notice of Motion is identical to the restraining order granted by Justice Nawana on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2012.
- When the Plaintiffs sought an order to extend it on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2014 I have refused his application stating that it has already labsed.
- 17. However when this matter was called on 7<sup>91</sup> February 2014 in the Masters Court in respect of the proceedings of the default judgement the Learned Master has extended the said restraining order till 2<sup>91</sup> April 2014.
- 18. Therefore the  $1^{\rm st}$  Restraining Order sought by the Plaintiff in the new application is redundant and unnecessary as the very order is a already in place.

- 19. The Plaintiff has not disclosed this fact when the matter came up before me and proceeded to seek orders in terms of his Notice of Motion including an Order which is already in place.
- 20. For the above reason this Court will not consider whether the other Orders sought by the plaintiff should be granted or not as he has already obtained one order from another Court and suppressed that fact to this Court.
- Accordingly, I make the following orders:
  - a) The Plaintiffs interparte Notice of Motion dated  $27^{\rm th}$  January 2014 is dismissed.
  - The parties to bear there own costs.

L.S. Abgygunaratne (

<u>Judge</u>

20/3/2014