

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

Civil Revision No.6626 of 2015

Date of decision:12.10.2015

Kanwar Singh

... Petitioner

versus

Mangtu (deceased, through LRs) and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar Yadav, 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. A court which set that no further objection shall be given after the Commissioner gives a report is said to have breached its own direction for allowing for objection to be brought by one of the parties. This is hardly a ground to be urged before a court, for, no Judge can set number of times that a party can object to a Commissioner's report or that no objection will be entertained at all. Every order that is passed is open to objections in the manner that the law provides and there can be no self-deprecating direction against any party that he should treat himself satisfied whatever the report is. Such a direction given itself in the first place was

erroneous and thankfully, the Judge did not fetter his own jurisdiction or cast an obstruction to any party to file objections to the report. The petitioner will sustain the report already given if it contains no fallibility and will not take an earlier direction given by the court that objection cannot be filed as operating to constitute a legal bar against the respondents.

2. With these observations, the revision petition is disposed of.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

12.10.2015
sanjeev