

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

**Civil Revision No. 6111 of 2012
Date of Decision: 02.3.2015.**

Dinesh Kumar and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

Anjana Mittal and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Vikas Bahl, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Arjun Kundra, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amit Jain, Advocate
for respondent No. 1.

None for respondents No. 2 to 5.

SABINA, J.

Petitioners have filed this petition under Article 226 of Constitution of India challenging the orders dated 11.9.2012 (Annexure P-2) and 2.3.2010 (Annexure P-1).

Heard.

During the course of arguments, it has transpired that the parties have concluded their evidence before the Trial Court and now the case before the Trial Court, is ripe for arguments. It has also transpired that plaintiff has filed an application for amendment of the plaint and the said application was dismissed by the Trial Court. The said order passed by the Trial Court has been challenged by the plaintiff in this Court and passing of the final

order has been stayed by this Court.

Learned counsel for the plaintiff-respondent No. 1 has submitted that even if the amendment sought by the plaintiff is allowed, then the plaintiff will not lead any further evidence in support of the said amendment.

Thus, it is evident that the parties have concluded their evidence before the Trial Court. In these circumstances, since the trial is at the fag end, no ground for interference by this Court, at this stage, is made out. Petitioners by way of this petition, have challenged the interim arrangement made by the Trial Court during the pendency of the suit. Any observations made by the Courts below while passing the impugned orders, shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

March 02, 2015
Gurpreet