

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

C.R. No.5737 of 2014

Date of Decision.08.04.2016

Balbir Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Garza Ram and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. A.K. Chauhan, Advocate for
Mr. Vineet Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Jatan, Advocate
for respondent Nos.1, 2, 4 and 5.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is aggrieved that his prayer for leading additional evidence has been rejected. The Court had sufficient reasons to say that the plaintiff had obtained permission for giving evidence and still after giving evidence, he was making undue delay by causing further evidence to be given. I will not find any serious error but by the fact that the Court thought it fit to issue notice, I am of the view that one more opportunity to be given on payment of costs of ₹10,000/- to the contesting respondents within a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order. If the amount is not paid as directed, the opportunity granted through this order will be taken as withdrawn.
2. The revision petition is disposed of on the above terms.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

April 08, 2016
Pankaj*