

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

1. CR No.7462 of 2013(O&M)
Date of decision: 10.09.2015

Chhabila

... Petitioner

Versus

Maan Singh

... Respondent

2. CR No.7308 of 2014

Goti Devi and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Chhabila

... Respondent

3. CR No.7312 of 2014

Goti Devi and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Chhabila

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Atul Lakhanpal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Rajwant Singh Chahal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CR-7462-2013; and
for the respondent in CRs-7308 & 7312-2014.
Mr. Ashwani Verma, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRs-7308 & 7312-2014; and
for the respondent in CR-7462-2013.

1. Whether reporters of local papers 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?

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

During the course of hearing of these revision
petitions, learned counsel for the parties have reached a

consensus that let one effective opportunity be granted to the plaintiff(s) to produce the affidavit dated 17.03.2011, as reflected in rapat Nos.21 & 22, subject to payment of ₹ 35,000/- as costs.

That being so, these petitions are disposed of in the following terms:

i) Plaintiff shall be afforded one effective opportunity to produce the affidavit dated 17.03.2011, as reflected in rapat Nos.21 & 22, on the date that shall be fixed by the trial court in this regard;

ii) In case, plaintiff fails to conclude his evidence on the said date, his evidence shall be deemed to have been closed and no further opportunity shall be granted;

iii) Plaintiff shall lead his evidence at his own responsibility without any assistance and process of the court; and

iv) This, however, shall be subject to payment of ₹ 35,000/- as costs and that shall be condition precedent.

September 10, 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge