

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.112

CR-7961-2017 (O&M)

Decided on : 28.11.2017

Baldev Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

Jaspreet Kaur Gill

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr.Sunil Chadha, Senior Advocate, with
Mr.Akshay Chadha, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Aayush Gupta, Advocate, for the respondent.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)
CM-25411-CII-2017

Through this application filed on behalf of the respondent, application filed by the petitioner under Section 65 of the Evidence Act; reply thereto filed by the respondent; order dated 10.08.2015, passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Ludhiana; order dated 20.11.2015, passed by this Court in CR-7703-2015; order dated 23.05.2016, passed by this Court in CR-6391-2015 and order dated 31.10.2017, passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Ludhiana, on the application filed by the petitioner for rejection of the eviction petition filed by the respondent, are sought to be placed on the record as Annexures R-1 to R-6 respectively.

Notice of the application be issued to the counsel for the non-applicant/petitioner.

Mr.Akshay Chadha, Advocate, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the non-applicant/petitioner and states that since some of the above documents are already on the record of the eviction petition before the Rent Controller, Ludhiana and the others are orders passed by this Court, he has

no objection if the same are placed on the record.

In view of the above, the application is allowed and the above-referred documents are permitted to be placed on the record as Annexures R-1 to R-6.

CM stands disposed of.

CR-7961-2017

In view of the liberty granted in the impugned order by the Rent Controller that the petitioner can get compared the signatures of the father-in-law of the respondent from other documents available with him like bank records or from any other document at his own as also the observation that it is for the petitioner to stand on his own legs to prove whatever he does intend to, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the present petition.

Dismissed as not pressed.

It is clarified that the petitioner would be at liberty to adduce evidence in accordance with law for comparison of the signatures of the father-in-law of the respondent.

28.11.2017
Jyoti-1/shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No