

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 1649 of 2018 (O/M)
Date of decision : 13.3.2018

Raj Bala

..... Petitioner

Versus

Raju Sharma

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Chander Shekhar, 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)

Heard.

In a suit for possession by way of specific performance of agreement on which defendant had denied his signatures as well as thumb impression of witness Smt. Luxmi, application filed by plaintiff was partly allowed and he was allowed to obtain the opinion of a private handwriting expert for comparison with the signatures of defendant and for that purpose, defendant was directed to come present on the next date of hearing. The learned counsel for plaintiff wants that comparison should be allowed from the Government handwriting expert and not from the private handwriting expert.

CR No. 1649 of 2018 (O/M)

I am of the view that the opinion of expert whether private or Government stands at same footing and its value is to be assessed by the Court. There is no ground to exercise power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to revise the said order. Consequently, revision is dismissed. Since main petition is dismissed, therefore, pending application, if any also stands disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

13.3.2018

sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No

Whether Reportable : Yes / No