

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No.6371 of 2015

Date of decision: 27.11.2015.

Tej Kaur and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

Rupinder Kaur and others

..... Respondents

2nd

CM No.22451-CII of 2015 in/and

CR No.6999 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.11.2015.

Tej Kaur and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

Rupinder Kaur and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not? Yes
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

Present : Mr. Amit Kumar Walia, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Garg, Advocate for the respondents

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

CM No.22451-CII of 2015

The prayer made in the application is not opposed, accordingly the application is allowed and delay that had occurred in filing the revision petition is condoned.

CR Nos. 6371 and 6999 of 2015

Defendants have preferred these two petitions i.e. Civil

Revision No.6371 of 2015 and Civil Revision No.6999 of 2015. In Civil Revision No.6999 of 2015, petitioners-defendants No.1 to 3 have assailed the order dated 8.1.2015, rendered by the Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Sunam vide which the trial Court had framed certain additional issues. Whereas, in Civil Revision No.6371 of 2015, they have assailed the order dated 8.9.2015, vide which the application moved by the respondent-plaintiff to examine the hand-writing and finger print expert in rebuttal evidence has since been allowed.

Having argued the matter at some length, learned counsel for the parties have reached a consensus that let both these petitions be disposed of with a liberty even to the petitioners-defendant No.1 to 3 to examine the hand-writing expert as regards issue No.6-A; **Whether a legal and valid will dated 26.01.1998 was executed by Naranjan Singh in favour of defendant, if so, its effect? OPD.**

That being so, Civil Revision No.6371 of 2015 is dismissed and the order dated 8.9.2015, vide which the respondent-plaintiff was permitted to examine a handwriting and finger print expert in his rebuttal evidence is affirmed. Whereas, Civil Revision No.6999 of 2015 is disposed of with a liberty to the petitioners-defendants No.1 to 3 to examine a handwriting expert to prove issue No.6-A.

November 27, 2015

Manoj Bhutani

**(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE**