

222

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

CR-5376-2014

Date of decision : 03.03.2016

M/s P.K. Industries, Moga and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Punjab State Warehousing Corporation

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. S.K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jastej Singh, Advocate
for the respondent.

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 order dated 07.08.2014, whereby, his evidence has been closed by order.

Mr. S.K. Singla, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners-defendants submits that in case, one opportunity is granted, he will conclude the evidence.

Mr. Jastej Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-plaintiff submits that there is no illegality and perversity in the impugned order which is based on appreciation of oral and documentary

evidence and prays for dismissal of the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties 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 opportunity (effective) to conclude 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.

Accordingly, revision petition stands allowed.

03.03.2016
yogesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE