

242

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

SAO No. 99 of 2015 (O/M)
Date of decision : 26.4.2018

Bhag Singh

..... Appellant

Versus

Namjot Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. S.S. Siao, Advocate,
for appellant.

Mr. Johnny, Advocate, for,
Mr. Arvind Kashyap, Advocate,
for respondents.

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)

Impugned in present second appeal against order is judgment dated 4.11.2015, passed by learned Additional District Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib, vide which case was remanded back to trial Court with a direction to record the findings on issues No. 4 and 5..

Heard.

It comes out that trial Court framed five issues. Trial Court recorded findings on issues No. 1 to 3, but no findings were recorded on issues No. 4 and 5. Therefore, lower appellate Court remanded the case back. I do not find any illegality in impugned order. Once the findings are not recorded on some of the issues, trial Court is directed to record the

SAO No. 99 of 2015 (O/M)

findings on those issues and pass the judgment accordingly. Consequently, appeal is dismissed. Trial Court is directed to rehear the case and decide the same expeditiously preferably within three months from the date both the parties put in appearance. Since main case is dismissed, therefore, pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

26.4.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No

Whether Reportable : Yes / No