

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 7404 of 2017 (O/M)
Date of decision : 8.2.2018

Narinder Pal Singh

..... Petitioner.

Versus

Union Bank of India and another

..... Respondents

Present:- Mr. S.K. Choudhary, 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)

Present petitioner was a guarantor of loan advanced to Ranjit Singh, who is respondent No. 1 before the trial Court, in a suit filed for recovery.

It comes out that after obtaining three adjournments, learned counsel for defendants Major Som Nath, Advocate, made a statement that he closes the evidence of defendants. Now, an application has been filed for adducing additional evidence on the ground that Major Som Nath, Advocate, was not authorized to make statement on behalf of present petitioner-defendant No. 2.

The trial Court after going through the power of attorney noticed that power of attorney bears the signatures of learned counsel Major Som Nath, Advocate, and, therefore, he was competent to make statement.

The learned counsel for petitioner contends that in the said interim orders, presence of learned counsel Shri Surinder K. Chaudhary, Advocate, is recorded.

However, that may be a typographical mistake. However, the

CR No. 7404 of 2017 (O/M)

fact remains that Major Som Nath Advocate, who was counsel for defendant No. 1-petitioner, had closed the evidence. The case is now fixed for arguments. Defendants are not paying the loan advanced by the bank and appears to be interested in delaying the disposal of matter. If defendants are interested in paying the loan, they can always approach the bank and repay the loan. Therefore, instant revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.2.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No

Whether Reportable : Yes / No