

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

Civil Revision No.1923 of 2017
Date of decision: March 17, 2017

Inderjit Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Paramjit Singh and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. Surinder Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Rajan Gupta, J.

This order shall dispose of two revision petitions filed by petitioner Inderjit Singh, one against order dated 23.11.2016, whereby application filed by the petitioner for directing respondent/defendant No.1 to appear in person along with ID card bearing his photographs, has been dismissed, and another order dated 22.2.2017, whereby application of petitioner for permission to lead additional evidence has been dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has assailed the orders. He submits that approach of the trial court is erroneous and against law. According to him, defendant No.2 Tarlok Kumar and defendant No.1 Paramjit Singh are the same person and thus, identity card of defendant No.1 along with photograph is very much necessary for just adjudication of the case. He further submits that evidence regarding documents pertaining to FIR No.106 dated 23.4.2008 are essential for proper

adjudication of the case.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and given careful thought to the facts of the case.

It appears that a suit for recovery was filed by the petitioner/ plaintiff against the respondent/defendants for recovery of Rs.5,40,000/- along with interest. Suit was instituted on 9.5.2011. During pendency of the suit, plaintiff filed two applications, one for directing defendant No.1 to appear in person alongwith his ID card bearing his photograph, and another application for leading additional evidence regarding placing on record documents pertaining to FIR No.106 dated 23.4.2008. Both applications have been dismissed by the trial court vide separate orders, by observing that applications have been filed only to delay the proceedings of the suit. I find no infirmity with the orders passed. A perusal of orders shows that first application filed by the plaintiff for directing the defendant No.1 in person was dismissed on 23.11.2016. Thereafter, plaintiff filed another application for leading additional evidence, which was also dismissed by the court on 22.2.2017 by observing that documents sought to be produced by the plaintiff are not relevant in the case. I find no infirmity with the orders passed. Both the revision petitions are without any merit and same are hereby dismissed.

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

March 17, 2017
'Rajpal'

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:

Yes / No