

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

**Civil Revision No.4985 of 2015
Date of Decision: August 11, 2015**

Ajmero

.... Petitioner

vs.

Gurmeet Singh and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Simranjeet Singh Sarwara, Advocate for the petitioner.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 05.05.2014 (Annexure P-2) passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Rajpura, vide which the cross-examination of respondent No.2/plaintiff (PW1) Hakam Singh was treated nil.

Learned counsel for the revisionist has argued that the counsel for the petitioner thought that the case was adjourned. Therefore, due to his mistake, the witness could not be cross-examined.

From the impugned order, it appears that learned counsel for the petitioner before the lower court did not cross-examine any of the witnesses and the cross-examination of the other witnesses was also deferred.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances and in the interest of justice, the petitioner is allowed to cross-examine

respondent No.2/plaintiff (PW1) Hakam Singh, subject to payment of costs of ₹10,000/-.

However, it is made clear that for this purpose, only one opportunity will be given to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the present revision stands allowed.

August 11, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE