

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

CR No. 6186 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.01.2016

Budh Singh

... Petitioner

versus

Harchand Singh and another

.... Respondents

2. CR No. 6187 of 2015 (O&M)

Budh Singh

... Petitioner

versus

Harchand Singh and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Ashok Kumar Khunger, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Mehta, Advocate for the respondents.

K.Kannan, J. (ORAL)

Needless overdoing of this case has been the cause in the civil revision petition. A particular inspection note said to have been entered in the revenue records forming part of the file of the Tehsildar, Abohar, was suspected by the plaintiff as a handy work of the defendant. At the time when the defendant was cross-examined, it was suggested that it was not in the hand writing of one Avinash but of Sanjeev Kumar. The attempt was to show that Avinash was the Clerk attached to the Tehsildar and Sanjeev Kumar was not and consequently the inspection note could not have been written by Sanjeev Kumar. When the defendant denied the suggestion the plaintiff wanted to prove by examining Avinash that the inspection note had not been prepared by him. The counsel for the respondent states that Sanjeev Kumar was also a staff in the revenue office and he has no objection to even

recording the petitioner's assertion that the inspection note had not been prepared by Sanjeev Kumar and not by Avinash. I record the statement of the respondent and think it is sufficient for the plaintiff to rely on to whatever purpose which he achieves will strengthen his case.

The civil revision petitions are dismissed as unnecessary and the examination of Avinash himself as not necessary in the light of the submissions made by the counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents-defendants. The costs of Rs. 3,000/- awarded by the Court below is set aside.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

07.01.2016

kv