

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 1783 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : March 31, 2016

Sumandeep Singh and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

Amandeep Kaur and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Ashok Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

The petitioners are aggrieved of the impugned order whereby the application filed at the instance of the claimants for examining Sukhdeep Singh, witness as an additional evidence has been allowed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that arguments had been heard by the MACT on merits and the case was listed for orders and then the objections were raised, moving the application at this stage, tantamounts to filling up of a lacuna.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and appraised the paper book and of the view that the respondents have right to cross-examine the aforementioned witness viz-a-viz occurrence of the accident or not, therefore, no prejudice would be

caused to the petitioners, rather it would enable the court to adjudicate the controversy between the parties to the *lis*.

The petitioners shall be at liberty to take all the objections viz-a-viz non-compliance of the order under challenge.

I do not find any illegality and perversity in the impugned order and the same cannot be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

The revision petition is devoid of merits.
Accordingly the same is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

March 31, 2016
archana