

CR No. 2345 of 2014

Date of Decision: December 01, 2015

Dinesh Chander

...Petitioner

vs.

Jai Pal

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**Present:** Mr. Naveen Daryal, Advocate
for the petitioner.Mr. Sajjan Singh, Advocate
for the respondent.

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Impugned in the present revision is the order dated 16.12.2013 (Annexure P-3) passed by learned Civil Judge(Jr. Divn.) Gohana vide which the evidence of the plaintiff was closed by orders.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the case file very carefully.

Copies of interim order dated 13.09.2013 and 23.10.2013 passed by Civil Judge (Junior Division), Gohana have been produced which shows that on two occasions last opportunity was

CR No. 2345 of 2014

:2:

granted. This was in addition to the normal opportunities granted to the petitioner. Despite that, he failed to conclude his evidence and thereafter evidence was closed by orders.

Since sufficient number of opportunities were granted and thereafter two last opportunities were further granted to the plaintiff, therefore is no illegality and infirmity in the impugned order in closing the evidence by orders.

Revision petition stands dismissed.

December 01, 2015
rimpal

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE