

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 8638 of 2014
Date of decision : May 2, 2016

Harinderjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Central Bank of India and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Bhriugu Dutt Sharma, 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 challenge in the present petition is to the impugned order dated 17.10.2014 whereby the evidence of petitioner-plaintiff has been closed by order.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-plaintiff submits that one last opportunity to conclude his evidence be granted.

On perusal of the order, it is seen that enough opportunities have been granted to the petitioner-plaintiff to lead evidence.

However, I am of the view that in order to advance justice, it is appropriate to grant one opportunity to the petitioner-plaintiff to examine one witness as per provisions of Order 16 CPC.

It is directed that the trial court shall ensure to summon the witness in accordance with law, however, the aforementioned order of mine shall be subject to payment of costs of ₹5,000/-.

It is made clear that the payment of costs would be condition precedent.

The civil revision petition is allowed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 2, 2016
archana