

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

**CM Nos.10388-10389-CI of 2016 in/and
RA-RF No.532-CI of 2016 in
RFA No. 6114 of 2014
Date of decision: 19.09.2016**

Rohit Raghuvanshi and another

... Appellants

Vs.

Union Territory, Chandigarh

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. Vishal Sodhi, Advocate
for the applicant-respondent.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (ORAL)

Applicant seeks permission to lead additional evidence by way of C.M. No.10389-C1 of 2016 and also seeks condonation of delay of 140 days in filing the review application, besides seeking review of the order and judgment dated 02.02.2016 passed by this Court in RFA No. 6114 of 2014.

Having heard learned counsel for the applicant, it becomes specifically clear that the additional evidence, on the basis of which instant review application has been filed, was not part of the record nor it was brought to the notice of this Court at the time of hearing on 02.02.2016. Applicant seeks to produce additional evidence to make it a ground for review, which is not permissible in law.

Amit Kumar
2016.09.21 14:17
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

In view of the above, both these applications as well as the review application are wholly misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, these must fail. No case for interference has been made out. Dismissed.

[RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK]
JUDGE

19.09.2016
AK Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No