

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

CR No.8205 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: December 04, 2015

Jaswant Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

Pritam Kaur and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Hemender Goswami, 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)

Heard.

Vide impugned order dated 21.08.2015 (Annexure P-1), learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Ludhiana, closed the evidence of the plaintiff-petitioner by orders after granting more than 20 effective opportunities to conclude his evidence.

A perusal of the interim orders shows that on the last three occasions, last opportunity was granted. Even costs of ₹500/- was also imposed upon the plaintiff, but he failed to conclude his evidence.

Under the Civil Procedure Code, only three opportunities are to be granted. The plaintiff had availed more than 20 effective opportunities but failed to conclude his evidence, despite availing three last opportunities, even burdened with costs.

It being so, the lower court was justified in closing the evidence of the plaintiff by orders.

Therefore, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order. Accordingly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

December 04, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE