

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.1158 of 2016

Date of Decision.16.02.2016

Gurtej Singh now deceased through LRs

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Gopal Singh now deceased through LR

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. HPS Ghuman, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. I will not make any intervention to the order passed already by the court below allowing for an evidence to be given which is demarcation alleged to have been done by public authority. It is a public document as defined under Section 76 of the Indian Evidence Act which requires no further proof. If the Court has not allowed for examination of public officer to prove the document, it has done what is appropriate.

2. The counsel for the petitioner wants me to refer a judgment of the Supreme Court in Sait Tarajee Khimchand and others Vs. Yelamarti Satyam and others 1972(4)SCC 562 which says that the document which is exhibited would still require to be proved. Section 77 of the Indian Evidence Act says that contents of public document is proof of what it contains and no further proof is necessary. There is nothing stated in the Supreme Court judgment which conflicts with

Section 77 of the Indian Evidence Act.

3. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

February 16, 2016
Pankaj*