

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

Civil Revision No.4800 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 03.08.2015

Anand Singh

.... Petitioner

versus

Smt. Pataso Devi

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Mani Ram Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ?No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. The defendant is aggrieved that on several occasions when he came, the plaintiff did not examine and when he did not come, the plaintiff opposed it and the side has been closed. He wants an opportunity to be granted to be allowed to be cross-examined.

2. I cannot understand how the defendant who is not fully cross-examined be aggrieved by the order. It should be the plaintiff, who must feel aggrieved that the side is closed even before the cross-examination was completed. The defendant-petitioner still has

an apprehension that his evidence will not be read. There is no order by the court eschewing his evidence. It is, therefore, incompetent for a court not to read his evidence.

3. With this clarification, the civil revision is disposed of.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

03.08.2015
sanjeev