

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

C.R. No.4520 of 2015

Date of Decision.29.07.2015

Surinder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Balwinder Kaur and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Surjit Singh Swaich, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.K. Bindra, Advocate
for the caveator-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?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The only point urged in the revision petition is that the petitioner was not physically present at the time of presentation of the election petition. He refers to the fact that the officer has endorsed on the petition that the petition was being presented through advocate. This, according to the petitioner, excludes the possibility of actual physical presence of the person and to infer that the petitioner was making presentation only through counsel.

2. Notice of motion. The respondent takes notice through counsel Sh. H.K. Bindra. He points out that the petitioner was cross-examined and not even a suggestion was put to her that she was not physically present at the time of presentation of the election petition.

3. In the impugned order, there is a reference also to the fact

that recounting was being ordered because the difference of margin of votes was very less. I have already set aside the direction in any independent civil revision already filed by the same petitioner and I have directed the disposal of the election petition after hearing arguments. The revision petition is against the order dismissing an application for rejection of the petition. Since the matter has gone through all the gamut of trial and it is merely at the stage of arguments, there is no need to entertain an objection taken before me now.

4. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

July 29, 2015
Pankaj*