

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

C.R. No.1948 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision.16.03.2016

Charanjit Singh Randhawa

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Jaspaul Singh Bhangoo and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Vikram Bali, 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 conclusion of the evidence and at the stage of arguments, the defendant wanted the plaintiff to produce the passport. This was an attempt on the part of the defendant to show that the plaintiff was actually in India to collect the amount which the defendant had paid to him which the plaintiff has denied. According to the defendant, if the passport is produced it can be ascertained whether he was in India or not when the plaintiff was actually denying that he had ever come to India.

2. The Court had denied the application for production on the ground that it was brought at the stage of argument and it was also the further reasoning of the trial Judge that when the plaintiff's witness was examined, he should have been confronted with reference to the entry in the passport. If that had not been done, it need not be forced on the plaintiff. I will find no reason for interference with the order passed

already. If the defendant can make an adverse inference possible by the non production of the document by the plaintiff, he will be entitled to do so and urge for consideration of the same at the time of arguments.

3. With these observations, the revision petition is disposed of.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 16, 2016
Pankaj*