

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 2410 of 2016
Date of decision : April 4, 2016

Nirmal Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Manmohan Singh(deceased) through L.Rs and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Arun Singla, 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 26.2.2016 whereby his evidence has been closed by order.

Mr. Arun Singla 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 26.2.2016 is set aside and the petitioner-plaintiff shall conclude the evidence in accordance with law subject to payment of costs of ₹5000/- which shall be condition precedent.

Accordingly, revision petition stands allowed.

April 4, 2016
archana

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE