

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that on that date i.e. 8.12.2017, there was a Punjab Band call and one of the witnesses was police official. Therefore, he could not appear before the lower Court on that date. The other witness was on maternity leave. He contends that infact petitioner got eleven effective opportunities.

CR No. 62 of 2018 (O/M)

Even if it is taken to be correct, the opportunities granted to the petitioner are more than sufficient. The petitioner wants one more opportunity to produce the said two witnesses, subject to payment of costs.

Though, there is no error in the impugned order dated 8.12.2017 (AnnexureP-4), however, in order to do complete justice with the parties, impugned order is set aside to the extent that one more opportunity is granted to the petitioner to produce said two witnesses for their cross examination on the date, to be granted by the lower Court, subject to payment of Rs. 10,000/- to respondent as costs. Further adjournment shall not be granted on any ground. Cross examination of said two witnesses shall be completed on the said date.

Instant revision is accordingly allowed to abovenoted extent.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

10.1.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No