

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

C.R. No.2163 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision.22.03.2016

Surmukh Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Dayalo alias Korhi and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Vivek Goyal, 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. The revision petition is against the order allowing for the defendant to bring additional witnesses for proof of date of birth. There was already an attempt on the part of the petitioner to approach this Court to challenge an order allowing for additional evidence to be given on the basis of birth certificate, I had dismissed the revision petition and I had held that even if it was not rebuttal evidence, it must be taken as additional evidence and the birth certificate is public document and therefore, the document must be allowed to be received as additional evidence. By such order, I was not literally closing the opportunity for adducing any other evidence with reference to the date of birth. I was only making an observation for point brought before the Court that the defendant could not have been given the opportunity of additional evidence at the stage of rebuttal. The order already passed by this Court did not foreclose an attempt on the part of the defendant to bring

any evidence which is material for the purpose of case. The Court below has considered the same in that perspective. I do not find any reason for interference with the order passed by the Court below.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 22, 2016
Pankaj*