

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 8086 of 2015 (O/M)
Date of decision : 1.12.2015

Suraj Mal

..... Revisionist

Versus

Jai Bhagwan alias Bhan

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Kamal Sharma, Advocate, for the revisionist.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-. -

-. -

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Vide the impugned order dated 29.7.2015, passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Safidon, the application of the revisionist for additional evidence was dismissed.

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

The learned counsel has stated that earlier he could not produce the draftsman as he was busy in his personal work. Therefore, his evidence was closed by orders. Thereafter, he filed an application for additional evidence, which has been declined by the lower Court.

CR No. 8086 of 2015 (O/M)

It is not disputed that the orders closing the evidence was not challenged and has now become final. It being so, the additional evidence sought by the revisionist is nothing, but backdoor entry, which cannot be allowed. It being so, I do not find fault with the impugned order. The present revision is accordingly dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

1.12.2015
sjks