

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

CR No. 2504 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: April 21, 2015

Devender Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Mrs. Urmila

...Respondent

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?**

Present: Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner cannot be permitted to bring any evidence which is inconsistent with the pleadings already made. The counsel for the respondent points out that the defendant has pleaded for a right of co-ownership by purchase and the additional evidence sought to be given is that he has secured a lease hold right. Additional evidence was declined by the trial court on the ground that the petitioner had no right to give such additional evidence. I will hold that even apart from the reasoning adopted by the trial court, the petitioner could not have been permitted to bring any additional evidence, which is inconsistent with the pleadings.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

April 21, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE