

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

**Civil Revision No.5928 of 2015  
Date of Decision: September 10, 2015**

**Sunil Kumar** .... **Petitioner**

**vs.**

**Ajit Singh** .... **Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

**Present:** Mr. I.S. Pabla, Advocate for the petitioner.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

**Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)**

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 06.07.2015 (Annexure P-4) passed by learned Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Panchkula, whereby the evidence of the defendant-petitioner was closed by orders. Also impugned is the order dated 13.08.2015 (Annexure P-7), vide which the application for review of the orders dated 29.05.2015 and 06.07.2015, was dismissed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the case file.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that vide order dated 02.02.2015, an application filed by the defendant-petitioner for taking specimen signatures of the plaintiff-respondent,

was dismissed on the ground that the signatures of the plaintiff-respondent were already on the plaint, affidavit and the evidence and the same can be got compared from the handwriting expert.

Therefore, when the present application was moved to appoint the handwriting expert for comparison of signatures of the plaintiff-respondent on Ex.R-1/A and R-2/A with the signatures of the plaintiff-respondent on the plaint and other documents on record, the same was dismissed, vide order dated 06.07.2015.

A perusal of the interim order dated 02.02.2015 shows that though the liberty was granted but the case was adjourned to 07.02.2015 for the evidence of defendant.

A perusal of the impugned order dated 06.07.2015 (Annexure P-4) shows that the defendant-petitioner was granted as many as seven opportunities to lead his evidence. He was supposed to complete his evidence within three opportunities. Thereafter, on 29.05.2015, it was directed that if the defendant-petitioner failed to produce any evidence on 06.07.2015, his evidence shall be deemed to be closed by orders. On 06.07.2015, the present application was filed.

I find no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order (Annexure P-4). No permission of the court was required to appoint the handwriting expert for producing him as witness in the Court. The witness was to be produced by the defendant-petitioner. The handwriting expert was always at liberty to compare the signatures of the plaintiff-respondent, which are available on the record. It was

after seven opportunities and even the last opportunity that the present application was filed so as to further delay the matter.

It being so, there is no fault in closing the evidence of the defendant-petitioner by orders. Secondly, there is no illegality in the impugned order dated 13.08.2015 (Annexure P-7), refusing the review of the order dated 06.07.2015 (Annexure P-4). The case is already fixed for rebuttal evidence, if any, and arguments.

Hence, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

**September 10, 2015**  
sarita

**(KULDIP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**