

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

C.R. No.3168 of 2015

Date of Decision.06.08.2015

Zile Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Lachhmi Bai

.....Respondent

2. C.R. No.3192 of 2015

Jhandu

.....Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Lachhmi Bai

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Raman Chawla, 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. Both the civil revisions are wholly with merit. They are against an order of the trial Court where the defendant-petitioner has applied to the Court that the plaintiff must appear in person. If the plaintiff chooses not to examine herself and would seek for prosecution of the case through the power of attorney, it is for the defendant to argue for making appropriate inferences. If the contention is that the plaintiff is alive and the documents are sought to be created in her name, it is again for the defendant to make use of the non-appearance of the plaintiff in person in spite of the defence taken that the plaintiff is not alive or doubting the identity of the person. He cannot compel any

person to be present in Court.

2. The application has been appropriately considered and rightly dismissed. There is no scope for making any interference. Both the civil revisions are dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

August 06, 2015
Pankaj*