

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

C.R. No.2652 of 2015

Date of Decision.22.04.2015

Harvinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Joginder Kaur and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Naveen Batra, 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. The petitioner has adopted the procedure which is unnecessary and has hence brought upon himself an adverse order. The person, who wants to tender secondary evidence, does not require to file any application for reception of secondary evidence. He has only to give appropriate evidence which would support any one of the grounds as mentioned under Section 65 of the Indian Evidence Act. The manner of how secondary evidence shall be laid has been set forth in Anupam Jain Vs. Kulwant Gupta in Civil Revision No.2991 of 2012 dated 09.03.2015. This Court has referred to its own earlier decision on this aspect namely Atma Nand (deceased) through LR Vs. Ram Sarup (deceased) through his LRs 2012(1) PLR 440 and S.P. Arora Vs. Satbir Singh 2010(5) RCR 50. The order already passed will not fetter the petitioner to resort to the action and the petitioner may point out to the case law on the subject and then seek for consideration of the document

which is sought to be placed before the Court. The Court will apply the law laid down.

2. The civil revision is disposed of with the above observations.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

April 22, 2015
Pankaj*