

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

[127]

CR No.7758 of 2015

Date of Decision: 19.11.2015.

Ranbir

...Petitioner

Versus

Kuldeep and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Harish Bhardwaj, 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)

The perusal of the impugned orders shows that ten effective opportunities were granted to the plaintiff, but he failed to conclude his evidence. Therefore, evidence of the plaintiff was closed by Court order. The suit pertains to the year 2011, four years have elapsed and the plaintiff could not conclude his evidence. There has to be some end to the opportunities provided to each party. Against the three opportunities provided in the CPC, ten opportunities were already granted to the plaintiff. No ground to interfere in the impugned orders.

The present revision stands dismissed.

November 19, 2015

Ankur

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**