

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.2829 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision.02.05.2019

Mukesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Smt. Channo Devi and others

....Respondents

Present: Mr. J.P. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

The petitioner-plaintiff is aggrieved of the order dated 13.09.2018, whereby, his evidence has been closed.

Mr. Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in case, two opportunities are granted, he will conclude the entire evidence.

I have heard the counsel for the petitioner-plaintiff and appraised the paper book and of the view that no doubt, the petitioner-plaintiff was negligent in concluding the evidence, however, in order to advance justice and prevent miscarriage of justice, I deem it appropriate to grant two effective opportunities to the petitioner to conclude the evidence.

Keeping in view the aforementioned observations, the impugned order is set aside and the revision petition is allowed, dispensing with notice to respondents in order to defray cost of

litigation and save time of the Court. The petitioner-plaintiff shall conclude the evidence in accordance with law, subject to payment of costs of ₹5,000/- which shall be condition precedent. If the costs is not paid as directed, the order passed already by the court below shall stand restored.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 02, 2019
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes

Whether reportable No