

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CR No. 2260 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 28.3.2017

Dr. Damyanti Sharma and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Haryana Yoga Sabha (Regd.)

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. Kulwant Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Present revision petition, at the hands of defendants, filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, is directed against the order dated 21.3.2017 (Annexure P-8) passed by the learned trial court, whereby prayer made by the petitioners for additional evidence was declined.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

A bare perusal of the impugned order would show that the learned trial court considered each and every relevant aspect of the matter, while passing the impugned order, which has been found supported by sound reasons. It is a matter of record that judgment rendered by this Court in CRM-M-21377 of 2010 [Dr. Damyanti Sharma and another Vs. Haryana Yog Sabha (Regd.)] was dated 2.6.2011.

It is neither pleaded nor argued argued case on behalf of the petitioners that they were not granted sufficient opportunity by the learned trial court to lead their evidence. It is also not their case that judgment dated 2.6.2011 was not in their knowledge. Having said that, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that the learned trial court was well within its jurisdiction to pass the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld.

It is the own set up case of the petitioners that abovesaid judgment dated 2.6.2011 rendered by this Court is already available on the record before the learned trial court and the same was attached with the written statement. Under these circumstances, it can be safely concluded that the learned trial court committed no error of law, while passing the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld, for this reason also.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners 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 under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Further, since the impugned order has been found supported with sound reasons, it deserves to be upheld.

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 misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance. Thus, it must fail. No case for interference has been made out.

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

28.3.2017
AK Sharma

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No