

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

CR No. 841 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: November 3, 2015

Krishan Dass

...Petitioner

Versus

Dharam Raj and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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. Harkesh Manuja, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Singh Gehlot, Advocate,
for respondents No. 1 to 5.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. Challenge in the revision is to the impugned order whereby the delay in filing the first appeal was condoned without notice to the petitioner. It was surely not a correct practice. Notice ought to have been issued to the petitioner before condoning the delay, but at the same time, if the delay was condoned for the justifiable reasons shown by the respondents, then such issue ought not be raised again in revision. Now that I have heard the revision petitioner. I find that he has no reasonable objection. The appeal is directed to be disposed of in accordance with law.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

November 3, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

