

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

C.R. No.5005 of 2016
Date of Decision.08.08.2016

Dhanwant SinghPetitioner

Vs.

Gurmit Singh and othersRespondents

Present: Mr. D.S. Gurna, 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-plaintiff is aggrieved of the order dated 13.07.2016, whereby, evidence of the petitioner is closed.

Mr. D.S. Gurna, learned counsel appearing 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-plaintiff and appraised the paper book and of the view that no doubt, the petitioner-plaintiff 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-plaintiff 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

August 08, 2016
Pankaj*

Whether reasoned/speaking Yes

Whether reportable No