

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Civil Revision No.2553 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision:18.05.2015

Ram Dev

... Petitioner

versus

Dev Parkash Sharma

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ? No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ? No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. The evidence which has been brought by means of additional evidence for PW1 conforms to the amendment application filed already. It is stated that the evidence is sought to be given for PW2 to PW4 as well. I have seen from the affidavit given by PW1 that there is nothing which is stated in para 6 of the new affidavit given which conflicts with or wash away the evidence which was already given by the plaintiff. The petitioner's grievance is that the evidence of PW2 to PW4 will be rendered in such a way that the previous admission will be washed away. I cannot vouch for such an apprehension since the petitioner has chosen not to file the copies

of additional evidence. I do not think any further time must be wasted for availing such an opportunity for the petitioner. On the other hand, I only caution the Presiding Officer that any additional statements that are given by the witnesses shall be confined only to the additional averments which are brought by means of amendment. The court will eschew any averment through the affidavit made by any of the witnesses which has the effect of withdrawing any statement made in the cross examination of any of these witnesses.

2. With this clarification and the duty cast on the Presiding Officer, the civil revision is disposed of.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

18.05.2015
sanjeev