

105
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
10/04/2019 12:38
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CR-2632-2019 (O/M)
Date of decision : 29.4.2019

Leela Wati alias Leela Devi

..... Petitioner (s)

Versus

The Ludhiana Shri Jagjit Nagar Co. Op. House Building Society Ltd. and
others

..... Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. B.S. Bajwa, Advocate,
for petitioner.

-.-

-.-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The learned counsel for petitioner-plaintiff contends that DW2 was under cross examination. He was directed to bring rules of society. However, witness said that he cannot bring rules of society. The learned counsel for plaintiff refused to further cross examination of witness and same was treated as nil. It further comes out that counsel also informed the Court that plaintiff wants to file transfer application and that plaintiff wants to file revision against said order.

While it is prerogative of party to avail remedy of revision, but telling the Court that plaintiff wants to file transfer application amounts to intimidating the Court. As such, conduct of counsel is unwarranted and is deprecated.

The learned counsel for petitioner states that due to fault of counsel, party should not suffer. He seeks further cross examination of DW2.

In these circumstances, without going into merit of case, petitioner plaintiff is granted one opportunity to further cross examine DW2, subject to costs of Rs. 10,000/-, to be deposited before Legal Services Authority, Ludhiana.

Disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

29.4.2019
sjks

Whether speaking order	:	Yes	/	No
Whether reportable	:	Yes	/	No