

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

C.R. No.1791 of 2016

Date of Decision.15.03.2016

Pardeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Smt. Shivani

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Vishal Handa, 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. The petitioner wanted to make reliance on a CD said to have been recorded through a device. I asked the counsel as to who recorded the conversation and how he came by information regarding such recording. The counsel says that it is an automatic recording device. Any recording is automatic through device but it has to be manned through some person who must be aware about the fact of such recording. If the petitioner himself was not a person who had caused the recording to be made then any such evidence which is brought cannot be taken to be direct, it must be only taken as hearsay. There is no information offered even before me as to who was responsible for recording the conversation and who was personally aware of such conversation. I have not been able to elicit any worthwhile response and therefore, I hasten to make no intervention to the order already passed.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 15, 2016

Pankaj*