

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

CR No.8024 of 2015

Date of decision : 30.11.2015

Sh. Balwinder Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Smt. Amandeep Kaur and ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment ?
2. To be referred to reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr. Madan Pal, Advocate for the petitioners.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioners-plaintiffs are aggrieved against the impugned order, whereby documentary evidence of the plaintiff has been closed.

Mr. Madan Pal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioners-plaintiffs submits, that two witness have to be examined in case one opportunity is granted.

I have heard learned counsel for petitioners and appraised the paper book.

The suit bearing No.214/14 was filed on 18.08.2012, though as per the impugned order, the petitioners-plaintiffs have availed numerous opportunity. Yet in the interest of justice, and in order to prevent the

miscarriage of justice, I grant one opportunity to the petitioners-plaintiffs to examine two witness namely Sarmail Singh and Khilla Ram, subject to cost of ₹5,000/- which shall be a condition precedent.

Accordingly, revision petition is allowed.

30.11.2015

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**