

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 2806 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : April 25, 2016

Sangeeta and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

Smt. Nanudi and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Varun Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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).

This Court vide order dated 14.1.2016 had given liberty to the petitioner to challenge the order dated 7.8.2013 and subsequent order dated 26.8.2013. The same reads thus:-

“After arguing for sometime, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks withdrawal of the revision petition to file afresh with better particulars by challenging the order dated 7.8.2013 and subsequent order dated 26.8.2013.

Ordered accordingly.

The revision is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as aforementioned.”

It is in these circumstances, the revision petition has

been filed challenging the order of the MACT whereby evidence of the petitioner, has been closed. During the interregnum there was stay of proceedings. It has been brought to the notice of the Court that the matter is still pending.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he wants to examine only one witness namely owner of the truck. In case one opportunity is given, he will examine the aforementioned witness.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book.

In view of the aforementioned facts, in order to prevent mis-carriage of justice and advance justice, I deem it appropriate to grant one opportunity to the petitioner to examine the aforementioned witness in accordance with law.

With the aforementioned observations, the impugned orders are set aside. The revision petition stands allowed subject to payment of costs of ₹500/-.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

April 25, 2016
archana