

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

CR No.7209 of 2013

Date of Decision:10.12.2015

Bhagwati

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Shiv Lal and others

.....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present:- Mr. Aashish Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate for respondent No.1(V).

K. KANNAN, J.(Oral)

Counsel states that there is no particular registered document containing the thumb impression of Ram Kishore. The reference of the thumb impression of first plaintiff in the order dated 27.7.2005, I notice immediately, is wrong and it should be understood as thumb impression of Ram Kishan. I do not think it is possible to allow for comparison with any document which is not admitted or which can ensure an unimpeachable containing the thumb impression of only Ram Kishan. The application said to have been filed by him for the post of a Numberdar does not evoke confidence since the respondent is not prepared to believe that there was any application or that the thumb impression contained in the records for application for appointment could refer to only thumb impression of Ram Kishan.

I cannot, therefore, allow the benefit of the comparison which the plaintiff seeks with the document said to be in the custody of revenue official purporting to be an application seeking appointment as Numberdar.

The order already passed is maintained but the petitioner is

given the liberty of approaching the Court below within a period of four weeks to offer any registered document that might contain the thumb impression of Ram Kishan or any other document for which the Court is prepared to place reliance as the authentic document containing the thumb impression of Ram Kishan. Such an exercise shall be done within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order failing which the liberty granted through this order shall be taken as withdrawn.

Revision petition is disposed of with the above directions.

December 10, 2015
renu

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE