

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

229

C.R.No.608 of 2014

Date of Decision:21.07.2015

Sahrn

.....Petitioner

Versus

Lehri Jagga and others

.....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? Yes**

**Present: Mr.Mohammad Arshad, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

**Mr.Charanbir Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No.3.**

K.KANNAN, J.(oral)

The petition for additional evidence was declined in claim under the Motor Vehicles Act (for short "M.V.Act") on the basis of disability certificate. The Tribunal must remind itself that the power under Section 169 of the M.V.Act grants a greater flexibility to devise its own procedure unfettered by the trappings of strict predural law under CPC. The denial of right to bring additional evidence was not appropriate and I find the order wrong and set aside the same.

The revision petition is allowed.

July 21, 2015
seema

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE