

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

C.R. No.2879 of 2016

Date of Decision.26.04.2016

Yad Ram and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Kanhaiya Lal and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Amit Jain, 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 petitioner is aggrieved that the written statement filed beyond 90 days was declined on the ground that there is no scope for enlarging the time. The order is erroneous and contrary to the law laid down by the Supreme court in Salem Bar Association, Tamil Nadu (II) Vs. Union of India (2005) 6 SCC 344. I dispense with notice to the respondent having regard to the ex facie illegal order and failure to exercise the discretion by the court below.

2. The revision petition is allowed. The written statement is directed to be received and suit to be disposed of in accordance with law.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

April 26, 2016
Pankaj*