

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

Civil Revision No.7040 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 19.10.2015.

Sukhdev Singh Jassal

...Petitioner

Versus

Abhinandan

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Vishal Garg Narwana, Advocate,
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 order dated 20.07.2015 passed by Learned Civil Judge, Senior Division, Mohali (Annexure P-1), vide which the evidence of the defendant-petitioner was closed by order after granting eight effective opportunities.

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

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks one more opportunity.

I am of the view that suit is for possession along with recovery of mesne profit. The possession is with the defendant and he has already availed eight opportunities

against the normal three opportunities to each party.

It being so, the Lower Court was justified in closing the evidence by order.

Accordingly, the revision stands dismissed.

October 19, 2015

Ankur

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**