

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

C.R. No.1967 of 2016

Date of Decision.16.03.2016

Amarjit Kaur and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Kashmir Singh and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Anupam Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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. Certified copies of revenue record produced at the Appellate Court with application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC along with translation in Punjabi from Urdu entries were received by the Appellate Court. The defendant is aggrieved. The attempt of the appellant-plaintiff was to prove the ancestral character of the property. The Court has observed that the documents are *per se* admissible and no objection can be taken. I must observe that the procedure adopted by the Appellate Court was not correct and application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC ought not to be taken up independently of the appeal. But having regard to the nature of documents as certified copies of public records, I do not propose to interfere although the procedure is not in accordance with law. The documents will be received and the judgment will be delivered in the light of the documents and what they purport to contain.

2. The revision petition is dismissed but with the above observations.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 16, 2016
Pankaj*