

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

CRR No. 2064 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 31.05.2016

Shoyab

.....Petitioner

versus

Nar Singh Adhana

.....Respondent

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kuldeep Singh

Present: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, 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?*

Kuldeep Singh, J. (Oral)

In a complaint case, under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, the defence evidence of the present petitioner was closed by order on 9.11.2015. Thereafter he filed an application on 27.11.2015 to lead additional evidence to prove compact disk under Sections 65-A and 65-B of the Evidence Act.

Heard.

It comes out that the transcript of the CD was not attached with the application so as to enable the Court to know what are the contents of the CD and whether the same is relevant or not? Further, defence evidence of the accused was closed by order after he was given sufficient opportunity. Lower Court has taken the view that it is dilatory tactics. I agree with the view taken by the lower Court.

The revision petition stands dismissed.

31.05.2016

**(Kuldeep Singh)
Judge**