

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

**CRM-M-10979-2015**

**Date of Decision : 29.03.2016**

Dr. S.P. Dhawan

.....Petitioner

Versus

Kay Gee Financiers and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH**

1. **Whether reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see judgment?**
2. **To be referred to reporters or not?**
3. **Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?**

Present : Mr. Pardeep Virk, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohinder S. Nain, Advocate for  
Mr. Udit Garg, Advocate  
for respondent No.1.

None for respondents No.5 and 6.

**FATEH DEEP SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

Learned counsel for the petitioner on instructions from his client has made a statement before this Court withdrawing the present petition, however, reserving rights of the petitioner to invoke the jurisdiction under the appropriate provisions of law on the same very grounds within the framework of law.

Allowed to do so.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has made a fervent prayer that in the impugned order in Para-3, the learned Court below has misconceived the fact that no separate application under Section

151 C.P.C. was ever filed by the decree holder and which is contradicted by the very own order dated 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2006 of the Court below, which clearly reflects that during the course of proceedings a separate application under Section 151 C.P.C. has been filed by the learned counsel for the decree holder.

Thus, the learned trial Court is directed to ensure tracing out of the said application and its disposal to ensure due justice to the parties.

Ordered accordingly.

**March 29, 2016**  
Dpr

**(FATEH DEEP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**