

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

235

C.R.No.1530 of 2014

Date of Decision:21.07.2015

Sonu and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Ravi Dutt and others

.....Respondents

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? Yes

**Present: Mr.Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate,
for the petitioners.**

**Mr.Sumit Sangwan, Advocate,
for the respondents.**

K.KANNAN, J.(oral)

The revision petition is against the order seeking to give full names of the parties along side the pet names called at the house as names of the parties in the plaint. The objection by the defendants was that the suit filed by the next friend had been negligent in not even describing the parties correctly. The Court also thought that it was an occasion to call for explanation of the guardian. He ultimately proceeded to dismiss the prayer for amending the cause title describing the names of the parties correctly. I find the order of the Court below to be shockingly bad. The Court is bound to

see that the parties are described correctly. If, there is some mistake, it was the obligation of the Court to ensure the same. The impugned order is set aside. The revision petition is allowed.

July 21, 2015
seema

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE