

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

CR No.7135 of 2015

Date of Decision: October 21, 2015

Satyavir

.... Petitioner

vs.

Balwan Singh and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar Yadav, 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 petition is the order dated 24.09.2015 passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Gurgaon, vide which the evidence of defendant no.2-petitioner was closed by orders after granting five opportunities including last opportunity.

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

A perusal of the impugned order shows that five effective opportunities including last opportunity were granted to the defendant-petitioner to conclude his evidence.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to an undated application (Annexure-P1) for summoning the witnesses, which is yet to be filed before the court.

Sufficient opportunities have already been granted to the defendant No.2, which are more than provided under the Civil Procedure Code. The mere ground that the suit is for recovery of heavy amount, is no reason to grant indefinite number of opportunities to conclude the evidence.

Thus, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order.

Hence, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

October 21, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE