

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

C.R. No.6624 of 2016
Date of Decision.03.10.2016

Sh. Dhanpat

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Babu Ram

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Naveen Daryal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

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 petitioner-defendant is aggrieved of the order dated 22.09.2016, whereby, his evidence has been closed.

Mr. Naveen Daryal, Advocate for the petitioner submits that in case, one opportunity is granted, he will examine two witnesses and conclude the entire evidence.

I have heard the counsel for the petitioner-defendant and appraised the paper book and of the view that no doubt, the petitioner-defendant was negligent in concluding the evidence. However, in order to advance justice and prevent miscarriage of justice, I deem it appropriate to grant one effective opportunities to the petitioner to examine two witnesses.

Keeping in view the aforementioned observations, the impugned order is set aside and the petitioner-defendant shall conclude the evidence in accordance with law subject to payment of costs of ₹5,000/- which shall be condition precedent. If the costs is not paid as directed, the order passed

already by the court below shall stand restored.

The impugned order is set aside and the revision petition is allowed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

October 03, 2016

Pankaj*

Whether reasoned/speaking Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No