

110.

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

Civil Revision No.1068 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision:02.03.2016

Bikramjit Singh

... Petitioner

versus

Sukhwinder Singh and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Ms.Jasleen Kaur Chandhok, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ? No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. The revision petition has become infructuous in view of the fact that the case has been disposed of by the trial court making observation about the fact that there was no stay. The counsel argues that the plaintiff did not have an opportunity of being cross-examined. Resultantly, the plaintiff's evidence has been eschewed and the suit has also been dismissed. The plaintiff may refer to mis-trial and the failure of the court to adopt appropriate opportunity as a ground of appeal and may seek for a direction, if the appellate court accepts the contention that the plaintiff must have an

opportunity to bring his own evidence by subjecting himself to be cross-examined.

2. I am afraid, I cannot make any intervention to have the decision reviewed at this stage after the case was disposed of.

3. Revision petition is disposed of as above.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

02.03.2016
sanjeev