

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

**Civil Revision No.5151 of 2015
Date of Decision: August 14, 2015**

Surinder Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

Swaranjit Singh

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Gurcharan Dass, Advocates 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 12.05.2015 vide which the evidence of the petitioner-defendant was closed by order and case was fixed the case for rebuttal evidence, if any, otherwise for arguments. Also impugned is the order dated 04.07.2015 passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Ludhiana, vide which the application for recalling the order dated 12.05.2015, was dismissed.

I have heard learned counsel for the revisionist and have also carefully gone through the case file.

Learned counsel for the revisionist has not disputed that the petitioner-defendant was given as many as 15 opportunities to lead the evidence. His only grouse is that the petitioner-defendant

had filed an application for permission to appoint fingerprint expert for the comparison of signatures of Harbans Singh -PW2 on the agreements to sell dated 09.08.2008 and 08.06.2009 and his standard signatures on the affidavit.

I am of the view that when the evidence was led by defendant, no such permission was sought by the defendant to examine the expert by depositing the diet money. In the application also, no permission was sought allowing the expert to take the photographs of the disputed and admitted thumb impression. The application was only for permission to appoint the fingerprint expert for comparison of the signatures. No such permission was required.

It appears that the defendant wants to linger on the case. He had availed sufficient opportunities to lead the evidence. No further indulgence of this Court is required to allow further opportunity to lead the evidence.

Therefore, the impugned orders are upheld.

Consequently, the present revision is dismissed.

August 14, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE