

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.1672 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision.30.03.2015

Piara Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Balkar Singh and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. S.K. Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. There is no scope for intervention in a case where the Court has allowed for reception of additional evidence on the plea by the petitioner that the Will is lost. The counsel for the petitioner states that the original was not produced on plea that it had been filed before the Revenue Authority but the order passed by the Revenue Authority showed that the Will had not been produced before the Revenue Authority. If the ground alleged already was not true and if the original Will is not filed but only a copy is given, the Court will receive the Will subject to objection by the respondent and the party in the cross-examination, is entitled to point out to any feature that would disclose that the plaintiff's production of secondary evidence is not duly supported. The Court will consider the evidence given by the parties and will render an adjudication along with other issues at the time of conclusion of arguments.

2. There is no requirement for intervention at this stage. With these observations, the civil revision is disposed of.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 30, 2015
Pankaj*