

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

**C.R. No.4761 of 2015
Date of Decision.30.07.2015**

Jagmohan Kaura

.....Petitioner

Versus

Jagjit Singh

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. K.R. Dhawan, 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. There is no need for apprehension that the judge could be prejudiced because there is a written statement filed by the vendor against whom he has filed a case setting out an alleged act of the petitioner as responsible for institution of yet another case by a third party. I have gone through the judgment. There is no mention against the present petitioner in the judgment in his reasoning for dismissing the suit. I do not think a Presiding Officer could, in any way, be prejudiced against the petitioner who has an apprehension of fair trial of the suit. The District Court has declined to make any intervention in favour of the petitioner. I do not think it calls for any interference in the revision petition.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

**July 30, 2015
Pankaj***