

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

**C.R. No.1648 of 2016  
Date of Decision.10.03.2016**

Palwinder Kaur .....Petitioner

Vs.

Gurpreet Singh .....Respondent

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Narang, 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. After the husband's evidence was closed, the defendant was trying to bring amendment to the pleadings referring to specific denials of certain allegations contained in the petition. The evidence must conform to the pleadings and not vice-a-versa. If the husband also been cross-examined, it must have been only with reference to pleadings already brought before the Court and after the cross-examination is over, the defendant cannot bring further facts or try to give further explanations. If they are merely matters of evidence, they are not required to be stated and the party could very easily explain the same by reference to Order 6 Rule 2 CPC.

2. The revision petition is dismissed but with the above observations.

**(K. KANNAN)  
JUDGE**

**March 10, 2016  
Pankaj\***