

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

C.R. No.3504 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision.21.05.2015

Balkar Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Manjit Singh

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Gopal Sharma, 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. The revision petition is against the order of the Court allowing for original document to be substituted for copy of the document which was already exhibited as evidence. The defendant is aggrieved that the document was allowed to be substituted even without any specific evidence by the plaintiff, for, it was an original promissory note which the defendant had executed. It is not understood as to how this petition can be brought before this Court. If the grievance of the petitioner were to redressed, the simple fact lies in a direction to the Court to allow for the plaintiff to speak about the custody of the original and the alleged execution by the defendant in favour of the plaintiff as regards the promissory note. The plaintiff will have such an opportunity to give that evidence and the defendant may cross-examine. I pass this order without further notice, for, I find no cause for intervention but I only impose an additional formality to be filled in to speak about the

original document which has been allowed to be substituted in the place of copy which was originally exhibited as evidence.

2. With these observations, the civil revision is disposed of.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

May 21, 2015
Pankaj*