

105

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 6928 of 2017 (O/M)
Date of decision : 15.1.2018

Akhil Bharat Varshiya Avdhut Bhesh Barah Panth Yogi Maha Sabha
..... Petitioner

Versus

Naresh Kumar and another
..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Chander Shekhar, 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)

Heard.

This revision is against the order dated 15.9.2017 (Annexure-P-4), passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Kurukshetra, vide which application filed by plaintiff-petitioner for taking specimen hand writing of defendant for comparison, was dismissed.

It comes out that a suit for declaration with consequential relief of permanent injunction was filed in the year 2012. The plaintiff has already completed the evidence. It was stated that it has come forth in the evidence of Suresh Kumar (PW4) that Resolution No. 2 (Ex.P23) has been written by defendant Naresh Kumar.

I am of the view that even if it is so, when the application has been moved, at that time the plaintiff had completed the evidence. Now, defendant evidence is going on for last one year. The plaintiff cannot file such application at any time he likes. There is no ground to interfere in the impugned order. Instant revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

15.1.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned	:	Yes
Whether Reportable	:	No