

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

1. RA No.152-CII of 2016 In
CR No.5600 of 2015
Date of decision : 11.05.2017

Amarjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Lal Singh

...Respondent

2. RA No.155-CII of 2016 In
CR No.3232 of 2015
Date of decision : 11.05.2017

Amarjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Lal Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.

Present: Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate for the applicant/respondent.

Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate for non-applicant/petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

CM No.12070-CII of 2016 in RA No.152-CII of 2016 in CR No.5600 of 2015

For the reasons stated in the application, which is duly supported by an affidavit, delay of 65 days in filing the review application is condoned.

Application stands disposed of.

Main cases

This order of mine shall dispose of aforementioned two review applications.

The applicant-respondent has sought review of the order dated 08.02.2016 passed by this Court on the ground that in suit titled as Malkeet Singh Vs. Lal Singh, an application for amendment was moved by Lal Singh defendant in the that suit in order to place on record the receipt dated 30.10.2013 in the suit for recovery of amount of ₹6,02,000/- along with interest on the basis of the pronote and receipt dated 20.09.2008 which was declined and revision petition preferred in this Court bearing No.3910 of 2014 has been dismissed vide order dated 30.01.2015, therefore the same very receipt sought in the suit titled as Lal Singh Vs. Amarjit Singh cannot be placed on record.

This Court had issued notice to non-applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of non-applicant/petitioner and has drawn the attention of this Court to para No.8 of the findings rendered in the aforementioned revision petition, which reads as under:-

“8. Even viewed from another angle this receipt even if is taken on its face value is not in favour of the plaintiff but allegedly is in favour of his father who is not a party to this litigation. The amendment is not necessary for determining the real controversy between the parties. In fact, the amendment sought is mutually destructive of the pleas earlier taken by the defendant, petitioner herein.”

On perusal of the aforementioned findings, it has been noticed that receipt had been issued in favour of his father. Lal Singh being defendant in the suit titled as Malkeet Singh Vs. Lal Singh had assured that receipt was in favour of his father i.e. Malkeet Singh son of Lal Singh.

In view of the aforementioned fact, this Court had allowed revision petition therefore facts of both the cases are different. This cannot be the ground for simply review of the order. There is no error apparent on the record. Even otherwise, time and again, revision petition has been argued in the presence of both the counsel.

Resultantly, there is no ground is made out for review.

Accordingly, both the review applications are dismissed.

11.05.2017

Pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No