

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

CRR No.920 of 2016

Date of Decision: March 16, 2016

Naresh Kumar

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Neeraj Yadav, 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)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 06.01.2016 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Rewari, vide which the application filed under Section 391 Cr.P.C. for additional evidence was allowed. In the appeal permission was granted to summon the Manager, Canara Bank, Rewari to prove the statement of account of the accused-petitioner and the register qua return of original cheque, by way of additional evidence.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the case file.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the trial remained pending for seven years and the prosecution had the ample opportunity to prove the case. Allowing the additional evidence will amounts to fresh trial. It is also contended that the order has been passed without giving any sound reasoning.

After going through the impugned order, I am of the view that after examining the facts diligently the appellate court found that the examination of the said Manager is necessary. The appellate Court has ample power to allow to lead additional evidence even at the appellate stage.

Thus, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order. Accordingly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

March 16, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE