

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 2386 of 2018 (O/M)
Date of decision : 17.5.2018

Avtar Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Inderjit Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, 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 2.11.2017 (Annexure-P-1), passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Talwandi Sabo, vide which evidence of plaintiff was closed by orders.

Perusal of impugned order shows that 19 effective opportunities were granted to plaintiff to conclude his evidence against 3 allowed under the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. However, plaintiff failed to conclude his evidence and same was closed by orders.

The learned counsel for petitioner contends that he had summoned a witness from office of Sub Registrar HRC Branch Mansa alongwith register containing cancellation deed No. 38, dated 29.6.1982. The said witness was summoned for 12.10.2017 and had not appeared despite service. The order dated 12.10.2017 shows that it was never pressed before the Court that said witness be summoned throughailable warrants. Therefore, the case was adjourned to 2.11.2017 and even on said

CR No. 2386 of 2018 (O/M)

date, his evidence was not concluded. It being so, there has to be some end to number of opportunities to be granted to one party. There is no illegality or infirmity in impugned order. Consequently, revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

17.5.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No

Whether Reportable : Yes / No