

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

**C.R. No.4793 of 2016
Date of Decision.28.07.2016**

Manrit Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Simaran Kaur

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Mayank Mathur, 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 is aggrieved of the order dated 14.07.2016 whereby, his evidence has been closed.

Mr. Mayank Mathur, 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 and appraised the paper book and of the view that no doubt, the petitioner was negligent in concluding the evidence. However, in order to advance justice and prevent miscarriage of justice, I deem it appropriate to grant one effective opportunity to the petitioner to conclude the evidence.

Keeping in view the aforementioned observations, the impugned order is set aside and the petitioner 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.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

July 28, 2016
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No