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

C.R. No.960 of 2016
Date of Decision.09.02.2016

Sohna Khan .....Petitioner

Vs.

Abdul Sattar and another .....Respondents

Present: Mr. Shailendra Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The plaintiff wanted a document to be produced from the defendant which was not produced and instead a photocopy had been produced. The court has not directed the production in the manner sought for by the plaintiff. There can be no objection which the plaintiff can take against such order, for he is entitled to make such an adverse inference that the law contemplates. If the original itself ought to be produced and the copy alone has been given without justification in the manner provided under Section 65 of the Indian Evidence Act, it will still be possible for the plaintiff to make such a contention at the time of arguments or at the time of cross-examination of the defendant.

2. There is nothing to be aggrieved about for interference in revision petition. The revision petition is disposed of.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

February 09, 2016
Pankaj*

PANKAJ KUMAR
2016.02.12 12:18
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document