

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

CR-3211-2016

Date of decision : 25.05.2016

AMIT KUMAR

.....PETITIONER

VS

SAVITRI DEVI AND ANR

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Gorakh Nath, 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 petition has been filed against the order permitting the respondents to file replication. Learned counsel has argued that in a petition filed by the respondents, the written statement was filed and issues were framed on 16.09.2014. Thereafter on two occasions the matter was fixed for evidence but no evidence was led and after a period of eight months, in April, 2015, the instant application was filed praying permission to file replication and the same has been allowed in routine with costs of Rs. 1000/-.

In my opinion though there was delay on the part of the respondents, yet no such prejudice has been caused to the petitioner which cannot be compensated by costs. Consequently even while dismissing the petition, I increase the costs to Rs. 5000/-.

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**

May 25, 2016
Sunita