

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

C.R. No.3455 of 2013

Date of Decision.30.03.2015

Raj Pal and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Rati Khan and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. J.S. Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jai Bhagwan, Advocate
for respondent Nos.1 and 3 to 5.

None for respondent Nos.2, 6 to 8.

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 for arriving at this Court when there are already orders passed stating that the appropriate approach shall be to resort to a petition before the very same Court which closes the proceedings and seek for reopening of the case by setting out reasons why he could not give evidence. The procedure of how to deal with such cases has been laid down by this Court in **Santosh Kumar Berry Vs. Nirmala Devi and others 2013(1) PLR 404.** The petitioner has arrived in this Court two and half years back and has allowed the petition to languish and waste still further time. Under the normal circumstances, I would have sent the case before the Court below for consideration of the petitioner's request but considering the fact that

the case is languishing for a long time and to avoid any further delay, I direct the order closing the evidence to be set aside on payment of costs of ₹ 10,000/- payable to the respondent within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. On such payment, the petitioner's witnesses will be permitted to be recalled for bringing evidence and the Court will deal with the matter in accordance with law. If the amount is not paid as directed, the order already passed shall stand affirmed.

2. The revision petition is disposed of on the above terms.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 30, 2015
Pankaj*