

271.

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

Civil Revision No.7099 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18.12.2015

Rishi Sharma

... Petitioner

versus

Nalini Sharma

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mrs. Kanwal S. Walia, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dinesh Kumar Jangra, Advocate,
for the respondent.

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. The civil revision raises a needless storm in a tea cup. All that is necessary is a fulfillment of a legal requirement for vouching for an electronic document. PW2, who has been examined to speak about the certificate that he issued for the document produced by PW1 as sought to be examined for the document produced by PW6. The court has rejected it on the ground that PW2 is not even authorized person and that further the plaintiff has availed several opportunities and no more opportunity could be

given. Respondent's contention is that the respondent has given even her affidavit and without cross-examining her, the petitioner is deliberately employing delaying tactics.

2. I am of the view that interest of justice would require that an electronic document already tendered would require to be duly authenticated in the manner required under Section 65-B of the Evidence Act and if this would require the cross examination of PW2 to speak about the certificate that he has already issued and which is the part of court record, such permission will be granted.

3. The order already passed is set aside and the revision petition is allowed allowing for the certificate said to have been issued by PW2 to be brought on record with such evidence as it is necessary.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

18.12.2015
sanjeev