

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

CR-1609-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : 13.05.2016

Kunal Manchanda

..... Petitioner

versus

Suresh Kumar and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jonny Goyal, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

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?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed against the order declining the prayer of the petitioner to lead additional evidence. It may be mentioned here that the petitioner-landlord had filed an application to lead additional evidence part of which was allowed and a part of which was denied. He was allowed to prove a video film which showed that respondent No.2 was actually in possession of the premises in dispute (as alleged by the petitioner). However, the learned trial Court declined the permission to prove some cheques which as per the petitioner-landlord had been filled-up by the respondent No.2 even though they were signed by respondent No.1.

The ground taken by the Rent Controller was that this fact would not be

of much relevance for the decision of the case.

In my opinion, this reasoning can not be faulted.

The petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

13.05.2016

Pooja sharma-I

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE