

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

CR No.7438 of 2016
Date of decision : 08.11.2016

Gian Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Madan Mohan 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. Sunil Agnihotri, Advocate for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner-defendant is aggrieved of the impugned order dated 26.09.2016, whereby application filed under Section 151 CPC for recalling the order dated 20.07.2016 vide which the cross-examination of PW1 Madan Mohan was treated as Nil, had been dismissed.

Mr. Sunil Agnihotri, Advocate for the petitioner submits that in case, one opportunity is granted, he will conclude the evidence.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner-defendant 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 to

conclude the evidence.

Keeping in view the aforementioned observations, the impugned orders dated 20.07.2016 and 26.09.2016 are set aside and the petitioner-defendant 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.

08.11.2016

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No