

...

Bachna Ram and others Vs. Union Territory, Chandigarh.

...

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

Applicant seeks permission to lead additional evidence by way of C.M.No.10205-C1 of 2016 and also seeks condonation of delay of 106 days in filing the review application, besides seeking review of the order and judgement dated 2.2.2016 passed by this court in RFA No.3404 of 2014.

Having 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 2.2.2016. Applicant seeks to produce additional evidence to make it a ground for review, which is not permissible in law.

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

14.9.2016
GS