

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

**C.R. No.429 of 2016
Date of Decision.22.01.2016**

AnitaPetitioner

Vs.

Sanjay Satija and othersRespondents

Present: Mr. Bhupender Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. A document which was received through a witness from HUDA is objected on the ground that it was a photocopy and the original has not been produced. The defendant may cross-examine the witness who has produced the document about the existence of the original and elicit from him any point which is in his favour, that can show that the secondary evidence received by the Court ought not to have been received. It should be borne in mind that mere reception of document by a Court or exhibiting the same does not dispense with proof of the document or even the requirement of having to prove that circumstances exist for reception of secondary evidence. These are matters of evidence and need not be interfered in revision.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

January 22, 2016
Pankaj*