Sanjiv Kumar Sharma
2018.05.09 10:47
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 6923 of 2017 (O/M)
Date of decision : 7.5.2018

Bimlesh and others ..... Petitioners

Versus

Union of India ..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Atul Bhatia, Advocate,
for petitioners.
Mr. Karminder Singh, Advocate,
for respondent.

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.

Impugned in present revision is order dated 24.8.2017, passed by Railway Claims Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh.

Perusal of impugned order shows that certificate issued by Municipal Council, Ward No. 10 was sought to be produced. The name of Municipal Council and stamp was not legible. Therefore, the document was rejected.

I am of the view that there is no illegality in the order passed by Railway Claims Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh. However, applicant can always file legible certificate, if they so desire. Consequently, revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

7.5.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No
Whether Reportable : Yes / No