

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

CR No.440 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision : January 23, 2018

Gurnam Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Satnam Singh Sandhu and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Anoop Singla, Advocate for the 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)

Petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 28.10.2017 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Jalandhar, vide which his evidence was closed by order.

Heard.

A perusal of the impugned order shows that as many as six opportunities were granted to the defendant-petitioner to lead evidence/produce documents. One last opportunity was given with warning that no further adjournment shall be granted. When the said documents were not produced, the evidence of the defendant-petitioner was closed by order vide order dated 28.10.2017.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner-defendant had concluded the oral evidence and wants to produce electricity bills, receipts and medical certificates.

These documents are not per se admissible and required to be proved by leading evidence, which means that petitioner-defendant wants

to lead further evidence. Sufficient number of opportunities have already

been granted to the petitioner-defendant to lead evidence. Therefore, there is no ground to grant further adjournment for the said purpose. Accordingly, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order.

As such, the present revision petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

January 23, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No