

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 1327 of 2018 (O/M)
Date of decision : 26.2.2018

Mubarak Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Kartar Singh Saini and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Munfaid Khan, Advocate, for petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-. -

-. -

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Impugned in present revision is order dated 8.2.2018 (Annexure-P-3), passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Jind, vide which an application of the plaintiff to lead additional evidence to prove the report of DSP, Jind, dated 6.12.2017, to prove his possession over the disputed property and to show the existence of tubewell and kotha has been dismissed.

Heard.

The trial Court has taken the view that plaintiff has to prove his possession and existence of tubewell and kotha by leading evidence. The report of police during the pendency of suit is not relevant for the decision of the case. Both the parties have already led their evidence. It was during the pendency of suit that plaintiff had moved an application before the police, on which the said report was made. The police officer was not

CR No. 1327 of 2018 (O/M)

-2-

appointed to make such report. Therefore, after both the parties have led their evidence, there is no ground to allow such kind of evidence. Consequently, instant revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

26.2.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No

Whether Reportable : Yes / No