

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

**CR-1457-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : 8.3.2018**

Radhey Shyam

..... Petitioner

Versus

Sheela Devi

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sumit Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate for respondent.

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 the present revision petition is the order dated 30.1.2017 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Jhajjar, vide which plaintiff-respondent has been granted permission to produce documents i.e., death certificate of Partap Singh; birth certificate of Premwati; certificate issued by Sarpanch Gram Panchayat Bhagwi and the writing of Panda.

Heard.

It comes out that plaintiff-respondent had moved an application for permission to adduce the rebuttal evidence. A perusal of the file shows that there are only two issues regarding maintainability and locus standi on which rebuttal could be led. Therefore, learned trial Court apparently allowed the said documents to be produced as additional evidence and not in rebuttal. Permission has been granted only to produce the documents.

The two documents are in the shape of death certificate and birth certificate. Therefore, it is taken that the said documents are allowed to be produced as additional evidence. However, it is clarified that order dated 30.1.2017 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned trial Court is only to produce the said documents and not to examine any witness to prove those documents.

Consequently, I do not find any merit in the present revision and the same is hereby dismissed.

Since the main petition has been dismissed, the miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.3.2018
preeti

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No