

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH**

**CR No. 8774 of 2015**  
**Date of decision : January 25, 2016**

**Meenaxi**

**..... Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Jagdish Prasad and another**

**..... Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL**

Present:- Mr. Amit Jain , Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

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 is aggrieved of the order whereby application under Order 11 CPC seeking discovery of documents namely certified copy of the proceedings conducted by DRT, Delhi has been dismissed and submits that petitioner-plaintiff being third party, DRT-I Rules do not permit of certified copies and therefore the aforementioned application was filed to direct defendant No.1 to place on record the certified copies.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book.

I am not in agreement with the reasoning assigned in the impugned order, for the reasons that there is no provision in

the DRT Rules which prevents the petitioner to apply for certified copy. In the absence of any bar/embargo the petitioner-plaintiff cannot be forbidden to obtain certified copy of the order sought to be produced at the instance of the defendant by invoking provisions of Order 11 CPC.

Keeping in view the aforementioned facts, I do not find any illegality and perversity in the impugned order and the same cannot be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

The revision petition is devoid of merits.  
Accordingly the same is dismissed.

**(AMIT RAWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**January 25 , 2016**  
**archana**