

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

CR No. 3305 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of decision: October 16, 2015

Shinder Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

Inder Singh and others

...Respondents

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: Ms. GK Mann, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. The plaintiff/petitioner seeks for an opportunity to summon the record available with the revenue authority for proving that the mutation sanctioned was by practice of impersonation and the so-called signatures of the plaintiffs brought in the official record were not of theirs. The burden of providing the validity of the mutation was only on the defendant. The plaintiffs would, therefore, have a right to rebuttal. It appears that the plaintiff availed seven opportunities but still did not secure the documents and conclude her evidence. I do not think there was any error in the order of the court but all the same I will give the benefit of one more opportunity in the manner pleaded only on condition that the petitioner pays cost

Rs.10,000/- to the contesting defendants within a period of two weeks of the receipt of a copy of this order. If the amount is not paid, as directed, the order already passed will stand. If there is proof of payment before the court, the court will summon the record on the date fixed and allow for evidence to be given in rebuttal by the plaintiffs.

2. The impugned order is set aside and the revision is allowed on the above terms.

October 16, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE