

233

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 2680 of 2017 (O/M)
Date of decision : 10.1.2018

Jitender Sehgal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Balwinder Singh and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Sekhon, Advocate, for respondents.

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)

Petitioner is aggrieved of the order dated 8.11.2016 (Annexure-P-2), passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Fazilka, vide which his evidence was closed by orders.

Heard.

It comes out that after granting two opportunities, the learned counsel for plaintiff suffered a statement on 3.11.2016 to lead the entire evidence on the next date, failing which the same will be closed by orders. In view of the undertaking given by learned counsel for plaintiff, the case was fixed for 8.11.2016. On the fixed date, he could not produce the entire evidence and consequently, the impugned order dated 8.11.2016 (Annexure-P-2) was passed. The learned counsel for petitioner contends that only five days time was given to lead the entire evidence. Since it was indeed, short time, therefore, he could not produce the entire evidence on

CR No. 2680 of 2017 (O/M)

that date. He seeks one more opportunity to lead entire evidence, subject to costs.

Therefore, without going into the merits of the case, one more opportunity is granted to plaintiff-petitioner to lead his entire evidence, subject to costs of Rs. 5000/-, payable to defendant.

Revision is allowed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

10.1.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No