

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

Civil Revision No. 960 of 2017(O&M)

Date of decision: 9.2.2017

Manjit Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Norata Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. Malkeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against the impugned order dated 14.10.2016 (Annexure P-3), passed by learned trial court, allowing plaintiffs to prove their documents already available on record, defendants-petitioners have approached this Court by way present revision petition.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners could not point out any patent illegality or perversity in the impugned order, so as to warrant interference at the hands of this Court, while exercising its revisional jurisdiction. In fact, a bare reading of the impugned order would make it crystal clear that it was only the negligence on the part of counsel, who did not get the documents exhibited while leading evidence of the petitioners, in spite of the fact that documents were already available on record. In such a situation, it can be safely concluded that learned trial court was well within its jurisdiction to pass the impugned order. No fault can be found with the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld.

Civil Revision No. 960 of 2017(O&M)

It is the settled proposition of law that rules of procedures are meant for advancing the cause of justice. Further, no prejudice of any kind, whatsoever, has been shown which might have been caused or likely to be caused to the petitioners by passing the impugned order. It is also a settled proposition of law that parties to the litigation must be granted due opportunity to put their best case before the court. Triflings and technicalities must not come in the way of doing complete and substantial justice between the parties. Having said that, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that learned trial court committed no error of law, 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 the 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.

9.2.2017

AK Sharma

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No