

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

253

Civil Revision No.2064 of 2014

Date of Decision:21.04.2015

Jaibir

.....petitioner

Versus

Richhpal and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.KANNAN.

- 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? Yes**

**Present: Mr.Sunil K.Rana, Advocate,
for Mr.Amit Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

**Mr.P.R.Yadav, Advocate,
for respondent Nos.1 and 2.**

**Mr.Shakti Kaushik, Advocate,
for Mr.Naveen S.Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for respondent Nos.3 and 4.**

K.KANNAN, J.(oral)

1. This revision is against the order declining to permit the petitioner to file additional documents after conclusion of the trial. The additional documents have purported to contain reference to date of birth of the plaintiff. The documents issued by Middle School Board and High School Board after conclusion of the respective examinations. The court below has doubted the bonafides of the petitioner in filing the documents literally seven years after the institution of the suit. The Court below has taken note of the fact that the plaintiff must have obtained the school

leaving certificate in the year, when he claimed he passed out. It has also observed that the school certificates ought to have been issued immediately at the time of passing of examinations, which according to the plaintiff, he passed in the year 1993 and it was difficult to believe that he could not obtain the certificates till the filing of the suit in the year 1998. This particular fact made a dent in the bonafides of the plaintiff. The Court has also made observations of the fact that Order 7 Rule 14 CPC makes reference that the documents on which the plaintiff wants to make reliance are required to be furnished at the time of filing of the plaint and if the documents are not in his possession then to mention their source. In the present case, the suit was instituted in the year 1998 and the attempt to file the documents was made in the year 2011 by way of an application for placing on record additional documents after the trial has concluded. Again, the plaintiff failed to state in whose custody the documents were, when the plaint was filed and he had not filled-up such details along with the plaint. In the facts and circumstances of the case, no case is made out for reception of the additional documents.

2. The order of the trial Court is elaborate one and in my view is well considered. I decline to make any interference.

3. The revision petition is dismissed.

April 21, 2015
seema

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE