

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 1849 of 2016
Date of decision : March 11, 2016

Urvinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Canara Bank and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Manbir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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 petitioner-plaintiff is aggrieved of the order dated 26.10.2015 whereby his evidence has been closed by order, as well as, to the order dated 4.2.2016 vide which the application seeking recalling of the order dated 26.10.2015 has been dismissed.

Mr. Manbir Singh learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-plaintiff submits that in case, one opportunity is granted, he will conclude the entire evidence.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner-plaintiff and appraised the paper book and of the view that no doubt, the petitioner-plaintiff was negligent in concluding the evidence. However, in order to advance justice and prevent miscarriage of

justice, I deem it appropriate to grant one effective opportunity to the petitioner-plaintiff to conclude the entire evidence.

Keeping in view the aforementioned observations, the impugned orders dated 26.10.2015 and 4.2.2016 are set aside and the petitioner-plaintiff shall conclude the evidence in accordance with law subject to payment of costs of ₹5,000/- which shall be condition precedent.

Accordingly, revision petition stands allowed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

March 11, 2016
archana