

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

**C.R. No.4195 of 2016
Date of Decision.08.07.2016**

Joginder Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Gajjan Singh and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Maninder Singh Bajwa, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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 counsel for the petitioners-defendants are aggrieved of the impugned order dated 16.09.2015 whereby, their evidence has been closed.

Mr. Maninder Singh Bajwa, Advocate for the petitioners submits that in case, one opportunity is granted, he will conclude the entire evidence.

I have heard the counsel for the petitioners-defendants and appraised the paper book and of the view that no doubt, the petitioners-defendants were 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 petitioners to conclude the evidence.

Keeping in view the aforementioned observations, the impugned order is set aside and the petitioners-defendants 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

C.R. No.4195 of 2016

-2-

already by the court below shall stand restored.

The revision petition is allowed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

July 08, 2016
Pankaj*