



**122 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CR-317-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision : 21.04.2025

**GOUDSHE MACHINE FABRIEK BV
(now known as ANDRITZ GOUDA B.V.)**

...Petitioner

Vs.

M/S SATNAM AGRI PRODUCTS LTD.

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL


Present: Mr. Manish Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner (through v.c.).

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner herein is the plaintiff in a suit for recovery of Euro 135,337.50. The plaintiff is a Company based in Holland. It filed an application for permission to appear as witness through video conferencing, which was dismissed by the trial Court on the ground that voluminous record may have to be summoned and therefore, the recording of evidence through video conferencing may not be feasible. It was further observed that no private mode of connection like Skype can be involved because there is always a possibility of somebody else being present in the particular room of the witness.

2. At present, the Rules for recording of evidence through the mode of video conferencing have been finalized.

3. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the revision petition is



allowed with the observation that the Court will permit the petitioner to record his evidence through video conferencing in accordance with 'Video Conferencing Rules', contained in High Court Rules & Orders, Volume V, Chapter 1-H, which have already been notified.

4. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

21.04.2025

neeraj

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No