

226.

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

Civil Revision No.4135 of 2014

Date of decision:02.11.2015

Inderjit Sharma

... Petitioner

versus

Bahadur Singh and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr.S.K. Rattan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Sethi, Advocate, and
Ms. Pridhi Jaswinder Sandhu, Advocate,
for respondents 2 and 3.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. The order already passed closing the evidence is set aside for the plaintiff cannot be faulted for the document that was allowed to be taken from his custody to the police. The court shall issue summon for the original agreement of sale from the criminal court where it is said to have been filed by the police prosecuting the case against the defendant No.1. If the document is produced in court, the counsel for the petitioner says that he shall be permitted to cross-examine the defendant. There is no such permission necessary for the plaintiff is always at liberty to confront the document and carry on with the cross-examination, a right which he always has.

The document shall be exhibited on production of the plaintiff himself, affirming the same and beyond this, no further opportunity will be given to the plaintiff to examine any other witness on the plaintiff's side. The court, while ordering notice, has directed ₹20,000/- might be required to be paid for unnecessary delay caused in the trial.

2. The impugned order is set aside and the revision petitioner will pay ₹20,000/- as costs to the respondents for the delay caused.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

02.11.2015
sanjeev