

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.7037 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 19.10.2015

Sanjeev Kumar and another

.....Petitioners

versus

Harmesh Singh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Bhanu Pratap Singh, Advocate for the petitioners

- 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)

Challenged in the present revision is the order dated 21.8.2015, passed by the learned Civil Judge, Junior Division, Patiala, vide which, in a suit for damages, the evidence of the plaintiffs/petitioners was closed by order.

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

The perusal of the file shows that the plaintiffs have filed a suit for damages against the bank officials. The suit was filed in February 2010. According to the learned counsel for the petitioners, the issues were framed on 11.5.2010. This means that the plaintiffs/petitioners took about three years and three months but could not complete their evidence. Even if one of the witnesses is ill,

it does not mean that other witnesses are also exempted. Ample opportunities have already been given. The case cannot allowed to be lingered on for indefinite period. Hence, the evidence of the petitioners was rightly closed by order. There are no merits in the present revision.

Accordingly, the revision stands dismissed.

Since the suit is against the bank officials, the lower Court is directed to decide it expeditiously.

19.10.2015

gk

**(Kuldip Singh)
Judge**