

202.

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

Civil Revision No.3915 of 2011 (O&M)

Date of decision:18.01.2016

Hira Lal

... Petitioner

versus

Ram Meher and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr.Rajesh Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

None for the respondents.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ? No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ? No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. The defendant who closed his evidence sought for production of additional evidence to file the document of purchase by the father which he, in turn, sold to the defendant for proof of his contention that the property sold was his self-acquisition. The court declined the same. The document sought to be produced was surely relevant and for the indiscretion of the defendant in closing the evidence and delaying the proceedings, I impose ₹10,000/- as costs to be paid by the petitioner to the plaintiff and allow for the

documents to be produced as additional evidence and tender such proof as it might become necessary for proof of the same.

2. The order already passed is set aside and the revision petition is allowed on the term of deposit of costs in the manner indicated above.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

18.01.2016
sanjeev