

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 2134 of 2016
Date of decision : March 21, 2016

Nihal Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Dharambir and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Parduman Yadav, 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-defendant is aggrieved of the order dated 18.2.2016 whereby his evidence has been closed by order.

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

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner-defendant and appraised the paper book and of the view that no doubt, the petitioner-defendant 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-defendant to conclude the entire evidence.

Keeping in view the aforementioned observations, the impugned orders dated 18.2.2016 is set aside and the petitioner-defendant shall conclude the evidence in accordance with law subject to payment of costs of ₹2,500/- which shall be condition precedent.

Accordingly, revision petition stands allowed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

March 21, 2016
archana