

223.

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

Civil Revision No.5499 of 2014

Date of decision:04.03.2016

Bakshi Ram

... Petitioner

versus

General Public and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. S.S. Kharb, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

None for the respondents.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ? No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. No steps taken for service on respondent No.1. Notice to 1st respondent is dispensed with.

2. During the course of trial, the plaintiff wanted to file some documents to prove the title of Ishri Bai which was relevant particularly in view of the fact that the plaintiff was claiming the declaratory relief on the basis that Ishri Bai was the owner and she had made a bequest in respect of the property through the Will in favour of the plaintiff. The documents were brought after the respective side was closed. There is surely a delay. The justification

for non-production is simply unacceptable. The court was justified in dismissing it. However since the whole suit will fail if the documents are not filed, I condone the delay on payment of costs of ₹10,000/- to the defendant within a period of 2 weeks. If there is proof of payment of costs, the court shall allow for reception of the documents on proof in accordance with law.

3. The impugned order is set aside and the civil revision is allowed on the above terms.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

04.03.2016
sanjeev