

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

CR No.7771 of 2015

Date of decision : 09.05.2016

Narinder Kumar Chopra

...Petitioner

Versus

Dinesh Chopra

...Respondent

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. Sandeep Vermani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Bector, Advocate for the respondent.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner-plaintiff is aggrieved of the impugned order, whereby application (Annexure P-6) seeking correction in the cross-examination at four places, where due to inadvertence, word “not” could not appear, has been dismissed.

Mr. Sandeep Vermani, learned counsel appearing on behalf of plaintiff submits that trial Court dismissed the application on the ground that the plaintiff had been instrumental in delaying the adjudication of the suit. He further submits that plaintiff is not responsible for delaying of the suit as during its own cross-examination sought correction. Suit has been filed for possession and mesne profits on the ground of the respondent being licensee, thus, urges

this Court for interference and allow the application (Annexure P-6).

Mr. Ashok Bector, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-defendants submits that similar application for making correction in the statement of PW4 was filed, which has been rejected. Plaintiff-petitioner read over and understood the statement being proceeding sacrosanct and, therefore, the application is liable to be rejected and urges this Court for affirming of the findings under challenge.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and appraised the paper book and of the view that on going through the cross-examination of PW1, there it appears the error that word “not” has been omitted as it does not make any sense in case question put in the cross-examination stated to be in english. In view of what has been observed above, impugned order is set aside.

Application (Annexure P-6) is allowed. Petitioner is permitted to correct the word “not” in the cross-examination only.

Plaintiff may not be aggrieved of the dismissal of the application with regard to the correction sought in the statement of PW4 as the application in hand is only for the correction in the cross-examination of PW1.

Revision petition stands allowed.

09.05.2016

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**