

**CR-6706-2014**

**1**

**IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH**

**CR-6706-2014**

**Date of decision : 02.02.2016**

Shyam Lal

... Petitioner

Versus

Inder Mohan

... Respondent

***CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL***

Present: Mr.Narender Dhillon, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sharad Chaudhary, Advocate  
for the respondent.

**REKHA MITTAL. J.**

The present petition has been directed against order dated 12.08.2014 passed by the Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Guhla, dismissing the application filed by the petitioner/defendant for sending pronote and receipt dated 15.07.2007 to Government Press, Nasik to know the date and issuance of revenue receipt (*rasidi* ticket) and the date of printing of *rasidi* ticket affixed on the pronote and receipt.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that in the written statement filed by the petitioner, he has raised a categoric plea that he neither borrowed any amount from the respondent/plaintiff nor executed the pronote and receipt relied upon. It has further been pleaded that the

pronote and receipt are false, fabricated, forged and fraudulent. It is argued that in view of stand of the petitioner in the written statement, it is expedient in the interest of justice that the pronote and receipt are sent to Government Press, Nasik to determine the age of stamp.

Counsel for the respondent has supported the impugned order with the submissions that the trial Court, on a detailed consideration of the matter, has rightly rejected the application, therefore, there is no reason to interfere in the impugned order.

I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the records.

In para 3 of the application (Annexure P1), it has been averred that the alleged pronote and receipt are forged and fabricated documents. Even the receipt/ *rasidi* affixed on the pronote and receipt dated 15.07.2007 are also much after 15.07.2007 and were affixed on the blank pronote and receipt.

Counsel for the petitioner is unable to explain as to what the petitioner wanted to convey from the averments in the application '*rasidi*' on the pronote and receipt dated 15.07.2007 are also much after 15.07.2007. As intention of the petitioner or the purpose to be served by sending the documents to Government Press, Nasik could neither be explained by counsel for the petitioner nor otherwise comprehensible, therefore, I do not find merit in the contention of the petitioner that the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

For the reasons aforestated, the petition is dismissed leaving

**CR-6706-2014**

**3**

the parties to bear their own costs. However, nothing stated in this order shall prejudice adjudication of the suit on its merits.

**(REKHA MITTAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**February 02, 2016.**  
*Davinder Kumar*