

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

C.R. No.4184 of 2016

Date of Decision.08.07.2016

Shamsher Singh alias Sher Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Jasbir Singh and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Narinder Singh Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

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 order dated 17.05.2016, whereby, his evidence has been closed.

Mr. Narinder Singh Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner submits that in case, one opportunity is granted, he will conclude the entire evidence.

I have heard the counsel for the petitioner-defendant and appraised the paper book and of the view that no doubt, the petitioner-defendant was negligent in concluding the evidence. However, in order to advance justice and prevent miscarriage of justice, I deem it appropriate to grant two effective opportunities to the petitioner to conclude the evidence.

Keeping in view the aforementioned observations, the impugned order is set aside and the petitioner-defendant shall conclude the evidence in accordance with law subject to payment of costs of ₹5,000/- which shall be condition precedent. If the costs is not paid as directed, the order passed

already by the court below shall stand restored.

The impugned order is set aside and the revision petition is allowed. A copy of this order be issued to the petitioner under the signatures of Reader of this Bench as the next date before the trial Court is 14.07.2016.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

July 08, 2016
Pankaj*