

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

**Civil Revision No.7913 of 2013
Date of Decision: August 18, 2015**

Kamlesh

.... Petitioner

vs.

Yama Devi

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Devender Arya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohan Sharma, Advocate for the respondent.

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 11.12.2013 (Annexure P-2) passed by learned Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Mahendergarh, vide which the application of the present petitioner for permission to lead additional evidence to examine Shri. Durga Parsad, Advocate, Notary Public along with the register bearing entry at serial No.1128, dated 20.04.2006 and Shri Bhup Singh, Stamp Vendor along with the register, was dismissed, observing that the case was at the stage of rebuttal evidence and there is no justification to allow the additional evidence at this stage. The case was accordingly posted for rebuttal evidence, if any and arguments.

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

It comes out that the plaintiff had already led the evidence and thereafter the defendant led the evidence. The case is almost mature and has been posted for arguments. It is at this stage, an application for summoning two more witnesses was filed. The said fact was within the knowledge of the plaintiff. No reason was mentioned in the application to show why despite due diligence, these witnesses could not be examined at the time of leading affirmative evidence.

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

The present revision petition is dismissed accordingly.

August 18, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE