

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

C.R. No.2869 of 2015

Date of Decision.28.04.2015

Shri Subhash Chand and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Shanti Prakash Jain and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. O.P. Goyal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Ranjeet Singh Kang, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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 is aggrieved that the defendant's side had been closed without affording sufficient opportunities for bringing witnesses. If the petitioner had appropriate explanation to offer as to why he could not produce the witnesses and there was any delay or laches in the course of issue of summons, the petitioner is at liberty to point them out and resort to a process of reopening and recalling the witnesses in the manner laid down by this Court in **Santosh Kumar Berry Vs. Nirmala Devi and others 2013(1) PLR 404**. There is no reason for the petitioner to complain that his side had been closed prematurely.

2. The revision petition is disposed of but with the above observations. He will resort to the procedure as laid down by this Court referred to above.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

April 28, 2015
Pankaj*