

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

C.R.No.992 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: January 21st, 2016

Ludhiana Improvement Trust, Ludhiana

...Petitioner

Versus

Tarlochan Singh & another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

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?

Present: Mr.S.C.Pathela, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms.Neha Sharma, Advocate,
for the respondents.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The present revision petition has arisen out of the orders passed by the Courts below deciding the application filed under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 of the Civil Procedure Code in favour of the respondent-plaintiffs.

Mr.S.C.Pathela, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-defendant submits that the suit has reached the stage of defendants' evidence.

Without commenting on the merits and de-merits of the observations referred to in the impugned orders, I am of the view that appropriate direction be issued to the trial Court to decide the suit as expeditiously as possible by fixing the time line for the defendant to conclude the evidence by giving three effective opportunities to the defendant and one effective opportunity for rebuttal in case there is any

rebuttal issue and decide the suit in accordance with law. Ordered accordingly.

With the aforementioned directions, I do not intend to differ with the findings rendered by the Courts below.

The revision petition stands disposed of.

January 21st, 2016
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE