

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

C.R.P.Nos.1282 & 1349 of 2017

COMMON ORDER:

These two revision petitions arise out of a common order passed by the trial Judge dismissing three applications, one for condonation of delay, another for reopening of evidence on the side of the defendant and the third is for recalling DW.1.

2. Heard Mr. Y. Koteswara Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner. Mr. T.S. Anand, learned counsel takes notice for the respondents.

3. The object for which the petitioner filed the present applications was to mark a written statement, filed in O.S.No.555 of 2005. But the judgment in that suit has already been marked as an exhibit.

4. More over, the trial Judge has recorded that one application or the other is being invented by the petitioner for stalling the trial. A series of applications taken out by the petitioner are also mentioned in the impugned order. In such circumstances, I find no reasons to interfere with the impugned orders. Hence the civil revision petitions are dismissed.

5. As sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

24th March, 2017
Js.

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

C.R.P.Nos.1282 & 1349 of 2017



Date: 24-03-2017

Js.