

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

C.R. No.970 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision.09.02.2016

Amandeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Chhinder Pal Kaur @ Jaswinder Kaur and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. MJS Bedi, 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. A frivolous revision petition brings a contention that proof affidavits given by PW1 and PW2 were substituted by longer versions than what was previously contained. The fresh affidavits were given on the pretext that some names of parties were not given but the new affidavits contained larger details. The Court had merely passed an order without serving notice on the respondents and without involving the respondents in any objection.

2. Since the order had been passed without hearing the respondents, I asked the counsel to explain before me of what prejudice was being caused by new affidavits which were given; of whether there were any particular admissions made in the previous affidavits which were sought to be withdrawn or there were any contentions which were set forth previously which were inconsistent versions made subsequently. There is no such situation obtaining in this case. The

argument that the petition ought not have to been allowed is without substance. The impugned order is not required to be interfered in such a situation where there is no prejudice.

3. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

February 09, 2016
Pankaj*