

**228 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CR No. 8548 of 2016
Date of Decision: 29.08.2017

BALDEV SINGH

-PETITIONER

VS

HARBEL SINGH & OTHERS

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Paramjit Singh Brar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has filed this Revision Petition against the order dated 21.11.2016 passed by Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.) Moga, vide which prayer for additional evidence was declined.
2. Civil Suit was filed in the year 2011. Issues were framed on 27.07.2015 and thereafter case was adjourned for plaintiff evidence on number of occasions. Plaintiff could not lead any evidence and ultimately evidence of the plaintiff was closed by order of the Court on 04.01.2016.
3. A Civil Revision No. 981 of 2016 was filed in the High Court which was allowed vide order dated 06.04.2016. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner made a statement in the said revision petition that the petitioner-plaintiff shall produce the entire evidence in one date at his own responsibility. In the

interest of justice, one opportunity was given to the plaintiff-petitioner to produce his entire evidence at his own responsibility, subject to payment of cost Rs. 5,000/-.

4. In compliance of the aforesaid order passed by the High Court, the plaintiff had already examined Baldev Singh as PW1, Darshan Singh as PW2, Netar Pal Singh as PW3, besides tendering certain documentary evidence. The evidence of the plaintiff was closed after compliance of order passed by the High Court. Thereafter, statement of Harbel Singh was also recorded as DW1 and defendant has also closed his evidence. When the case was fixed for rebuttal evidence and arguments, the present application under Order 18 Rule 17-A CPC came to be filed.

5. This Court cannot enlarge the scope of order dated 04.01.2016 passed in Civil Revision No. 981 of 2016. The plaintiff had already complied with the directions and thereafter, evidence of the plaintiff was closed.

6. In view of above, I find no error of jurisdiction in the impugned order dated 21.11.2016 passed by the trial Court. This revision petition is accordingly, dismissed.

29.08.2017
jyoti3

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE