

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

CR No.5852 of 2016
Date of decision : 08.09.2016

Anil Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Neena Banta and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment ?
2. To be referred to reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner-plaintiff is aggrieved of the impugned order dated 24.08.2016, whereby evidence of the petitioner-plaintiff has been closed.

Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner submits that only cross-examination of the Handwriting expert has to be done, by that time evidence has been closed. In case, one opportunity is granted, he will conclude the evidence.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner-plaintiff and appraised the paper book.

In order to advance justice and prevent miscarriage of justice, I deem it appropriate to grant one effective opportunity to the petitioner-plaintiff to conclude the evidence.

Keeping in view the aforementioned observations, the impugned order is set aside and the petitioner-plaintiff shall be given liberty to conclude the evidence, subject to the cost of Rs.5000/-, which shall be condition precedent. If the costs is not paid as directed, the order passed already by the Courts below shall stands restored.

The revision petition is allowed.

08.09.2016

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No