

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

CR No.5917 of 2015.

Date of Decision: 10.09.2015.

Mahinder Singh Jaglan alias Mahinder JaglanPetitioner.

VERSUS

Parveen and othersRespondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SNEH PRASHAR.

Present: Mr. Harkesh Manuja, Advocate for the petitioner.

SNEH PRASHAR, J.

This is a petition under Article 227 of Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 20.08.2015 passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panipat, vide which the application filed by the petitioner seeking permission to lead additional evidence was declined.

The submissions of learned counsel representing the petitioner have been considered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the revenue documents Ex.DW3/B and Ex.DW3/D were tendered in evidence by Sultan Singh (respondent No.3). Since the said documents are in Urdu which is not official Court language, it has become necessary for the petitioner (plaintiff in the suit) to produce and prove the Hindi version of the said documents in

order to facilitate the Court to scrutinize the documents rightly and effectively for proper adjudication of the rights of the parties. Learned counsel contended that the application filed by the petitioner for the said purpose was illegally dismissed by learned trial Court.

There is absolutely no merit in the argument of learned counsel for the petitioner. Admittedly, the documents, may be in Urdu language, have already been tendered in evidence by the defendant-respondent No.3. Learned counsel for the petitioner failed to quote any provision of law under which the opposite party has a right to produce and prove the translated version of the said documents. Learned trial Court has rightly dismissed the application of the petitioner in that regard.

Admittedly, the documents have already been taken in evidence by the trial Court. If at all, the Court finds that it is unable to read the documents because of the language in which they are written, it is always open to the Court for its convenience, to call for their translated version in official Court language, attested by the counsel/party, who has produced/proved the same. No evidence is required to be led for proving the translated version. It will be the subjective satisfaction of the Court while accepting the translated version of the documents.

There being no illegality or perversity in the order of learned trial Court calling for intervention, the petition is dismissed.

(SNEH PRASHAR)
JUDGE

10.09.2015.
jitender