

121

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

C.R. No.2846 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 25.04.2016

Smt. Kaushal Rani @ Kaushalya Devi

..... Petitioner

Versus

Ramesh Kumar and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. A.K. Khunger, 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?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This revision has been filed against the order dated 29.03.2016 declining application of the petitioner-landlord to summon two witnesses in her rebuttal evidence.

The trial Court has noticed that apart from other things the evidence which the petitioner is now seeking to lead relates to issue Nos.1 and 2 to onus of which was on the petitioner herself. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon a Division Bench Judgment of this Court in the matter of *Avtar Singh and another vs. Baldev Singh and others, reported as 2015(1) Civil Court Cases 728 (P&H)*, wherein also it was held that a plaintiff could only lead evidence in rebuttal on those issues the onus

of which was on the defendant as envisaged in Order 18 Rule 3 CPC.

I find no fault with the impugned order. Consequently, the revision petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending Civil Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

April 25, 2016
ashish

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE