

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

**C.R. No.1295 of 2016
Date of Decision.19.02.2016**

Shiv SinghPetitioner

Vs.

Om Parkash and othersRespondents

Present: Mr. Anil Malik, 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. A secondary evidence was sought to be produced through an application and the Court rejected it. Therefore, the petitioner is in revision. Neither the petitioner nor the Court will understand any law that has already been set forth through the judgments of Supreme Court and this Court. I set aside the order and allow for the document to be received, if the petitioner gives any evidence of any one of the grounds available under Section 65(a) to (g) of the Indian Evidence Act. If the ground is made for reception of secondary evidence, the Court will receive the document and allow for cross-examination to be done to test the correctness of any of the assertions made by the plaintiff.

2. I dispense with notice to the respondents, set aside the order and allow the revision petition.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

February 19, 2016
Pankaj*