

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

**CRR No.136 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: April 28, 2016**

Satvir Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

Suraj Mall

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr.Prashant Vashisth, Advocate for the petitioner.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

CRM-1241-2016

There is delay of 55 days in filing the present revision petition.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, delay of 55 days in filing the present revision petition is condoned, subject to all just exception.

Application stands disposed of.

Main case

The short prayer of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner should be given one more opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses.

A perusal of the impugned order dated 07.08.2015 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana, shows that on the said date, accused did not appear as counsel filed application for his personal appearance and then slipped away. The Court treated the cross-examination of the witnesses as nil.

In these circumstances, to avoid unnecessary delay and without issuing notice to the opposite party, the petitioner is granted one more opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses, subject to payment of Rs.5,000/-, to be deposited in the District Legal Aid Funds, Ludhiana.

Accordingly, the present revision petition stands allowed.

April 28, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE