

Civil Revision No. 1661 of 2016
Date of Decision: 4.4.2016

Sukhdev Singh

---Petitioner

versus

Rajender Kumar

---Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: Mr. Naresh Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Rekha Mittal, J.

The present petition lays challenge to order dated 19.2.2016 (Annexure P-1) passed by the trial court dismissing application of the petitioner for sending the pronote to Government Press Nasik to verify date of issuance of revenue stamp.

The learned trial court dismissed the application holding that there is no limitation prescribed for use of revenue stamps and as such even if an old stamp has been used on the pronote dated 15.2.2012 it cannot be said that the pronote had become invalid on that ground.

Counsel for the petitioner, on March 04, 2011 prayed for time to examine the stamp rules or any other relevant rules/statutory provision to show that there is a specific period of validity of a revenue stamp.

Counsel for the petitioner has fairly conceded

that there is no such rule or statutory provision prescribing period of validity of a revenue stamp in order to substantiate his plea that the pronote and receipt have become invalid as the revenue stamp used is an old one. The mere fact that the petitioner has raised a plea that his thumb impressions were obtained on blank papers is not sufficient to accept his plea for sending the documents to the Government Press at Nasik. In this view of the matter, I do not find any error much less illegality in the impugned order warranting intervention in exercise of supervisory jurisdiction of this Court.

Dismissed.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

4.4.2016
PARAMJIT