

CR No. 3232 of 2016

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 3232 of 2016
Date of decision : May 27, 2016

M/s Nand Ispat, B-16, Nehru Ground, NIT, Faridabad

..... Petitioner

Versus

M/s Satish Steel RE-Rolling Mills and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

**Present:- Mr. Ramandeep Singh, 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-defendant is aggrieved of the impugned order whereby application moved under Order 11 Rule 14 CPC calling upon

the plaintiff to produce documents mentioned in the list a to c has been dismissed.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the aforementioned documents are essential and necessary for adjudication of *lis* in a suit wherein respondents-plaintiffs sought declaration with consequential relief of permanent injunction. The documents relate to the account of the plaintiff i.e. certified copies of statement of accounts from 1.4.2002 to 31.3.2003, Attendance register, Excise RG-23D register for the period from 1.4.2002 to 31.3.2003.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book and of the view that in case the respondents-plaintiffs are in possession of the documents, the remedy is to move an application in accordance with law and not in the manner and mode as had been adopted by the petitioner, rightly so, the trial court has dismissed the application on the premise that documents pertain to the year 2002-03 so the same are no more in existence being very old and have been destroyed being irrelevant.

I do not find any illegality and perversity in the impugned order and the same cannot be said to have been passed without

jurisdiction.

The revision petition is devoid of merits. Accordingly
the same is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 27, 2016
archana