

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

C.R. No.2857 of 2015

Date of Decision.28.04.2015

Dhanwant Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Harpal Singh Mann (deceased) through his LR's and others

.....Respondents

2. C.R. No.2858 of 2015

Dhanwant Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Mahipal Singh Mann and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Baljinder Singh, 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. There is no justification at this stage, for, if the trial Court has denied the plaintiff the benefit of explanation of his admission, it will be open for him to challenge it as a ground of appeal under Section 105 CPC, if the ultimate judgment turns out against him. He is entitled to point out that the statement was made by inadvertence and not deliberate statement of admission. There is a principle that evidence must be read as a whole and the statement must be read in the context in which it was uttered. The observation of this Court in the earlier civil revision petition that a misstatement could be explained ought not to mean that the party will be permitted to give further evidence to

amend what is urged by the opposite party as admission. There is nothing illegal about the order for interference under Article 227 of the Constitution.

2. Both the civil revisions are dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

April 28, 2015
Pankaj*