

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.1072 of 2017
Date of decision: 15.02.2017

Sukhwinder Kaur

... Petitioner

Vs.

Surinder Kaur and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. S.S. Hira, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (ORAL)

Feeling aggrieved against the order dated 02.02.2017 passed by the learned trial Court framing additional issue No.2A, allowing the application of the defendants, plaintiff has approached this Court by way of present revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, for setting aside the impugned order.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

A bare perusal of the impugned order would show that the learned trial Court committed no error of law, while passing the impugned order. It is so said because framing of additional issue No.2A was necessary for complete adjudication of the dispute between the parties. Passing of the impugned order will certainly facilitate the learned trial Court to arrive at a just conclusion, with a view to do complete and substantial justice between the parties. It shall also avoid multiplicity of the litigation.

Further, no prejudice of any kind whatsoever has been caused or is

likely to be cased to the petitioner, by passing the impugned order. Having said that, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that learned trial Court was well within its jurisdiction, while passing the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner could not point out any patent illegality or perversity in the impugned order, which may warrant interference at the hands of this Court, while exercising its revisional jurisdiction. It goes without saying that it must be the endeavour of every Court of law to do complete and substantial justice between the parties and also to avoid multiplicity of litigation, while completely adjudicating the dispute. That's what has been done by the learned trial Court, while passing the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld, for this reason also.

No other argument was raised.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this Court is of the considered view that present revision petition is wholly misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, it must fail. No ground for interference has been made out.

Resultantly, with the abovesaid observations made, instant revision petition stands dismissed, however, with no order as to costs.

[RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK]
JUDGE

15.02.2017

vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No