

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

Civil Revision No.7811 of 2015
Date of Decision: November 20, 2015

Jatinder Pal Singh & another

...Petitioners

Versus

Municipal Corporation, Jalandhar & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

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?

Present: Mr.Sukhbir Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-plaintiffs submits that the plaintiffs only want to examine attorney of plaintiff No.3 and two more witnesses as per the provisions of Order 16 Rule 1-A of the Civil Procedure Code, in essence would not seek assistance of the Court to summon the witnesses in case one opportunity is granted subject to terms and conditions which this court may impose.

Vide order dated 28.8.2005, the evidence of the plaintiffs was closed by order. In order to prevent miscarriage of justice, I deem it appropriate to grant one opportunity to the petitioners to examine the attorney of plaintiff No.3 and two more witnesses as per the provisions of Order 16 Rule 1-A CPC in accordance with law on the next date of hearing, subject to payment of ₹5,000/- as costs.

It is made clear the the costs shall be condition precedent

before the opportunity is availed.

The revision petition is accordingly disposed of.

Copy of the order be given *dasti* to the counsel for the petitioners under the signatures of the Reader of this Court.

November 20, 2015
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE