

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

C.R. No.5401 of 2016

Date of Decision.23.08.2016

Smt. Urmila and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Smt. Savitri Devi

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Manjeet Singh, 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 petitioners-defendants are aggrieved of the orders dated 4.7.2016 & 14.07.2016, whereby, evidence of defendant has been closed by Court orders.

Mr. Manjeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioners submits that in case, one opportunity is granted, he will conclude the cross-examination of DW1 and evidence of two other witnesses.

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 one effective opportunity 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 cross-examination of DW1 and evidence of two other witnesses in accordance with

law subject to payment of costs of ₹7500/- 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 orders are set aside and the revision petition is allowed.

**(AMIT RAWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**August 23, 2016**  
Pankaj\*

Whether reasoned/speaking      Yes

Whether reportable                      No