

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

**C.R. No.962 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision.09.02.2016**

M/s Nano Lab Pvt. Ltd.

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Sneh (since deceased) through LRs

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, 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 application for recall of PW2 was made on a plea that an amendment of written statement had been allowed and therefore, more evidence would require to be given on the basis of amendment in the written statement. The Court has declined it.

2. An amendment brings a new situation and if the plaintiff wanted to confront the document produced with reference to the amended pleadings, it should have been allowed by the court below. I set aside the order already passed dispensing with notice to respondents having regard to the fact that there can be no prejudice for such an exercise and allow the revision petition. PW2 will be recalled on payment of costs of ₹2500/- to the plaintiff for expenses and the defendant will have a right of cross-examination of PW2 on the amended written statement.

3. The revision petition is allowed on the above terms.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

February 09, 2016
Pankaj*