

115

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

**Civil Revision No.199 of 2019
Date of Decision: 15.01.2019**

Jaspal Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs

Girdhari Lal and another

....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. P.K. Ganga, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

[1]. Civil Revision No.89 of 2019 filed by the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file fresh revision petition with better particulars vide order dated 10.01.2019.

[2]. This revision petition has been preferred against the order dated 12.07.2018, passed by the Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.) Ellenabad, vide which evidence of the petitioner was closed by order of the Court. Thereafter an application was filed for leading additional evidence on the premise that petitioner had to contest some previous litigation in the High Court where she was being accompanied by Girdhari Lal, who obtained signatures of the petitioner on some blank papers and the agreement in question is the outcome of such fraud.

[3]. It was pleaded that the scrutiny of the aforesaid agreement of sale dated 31.01.2015 would show that the signatures of Jaspal Kaur (petitioner) and Sukhchain Singh were appended on blank papers. Examination of Handwriting and Fingerprint Expert was sought to be prayed by way of leading additional evidence.

[4]. The trial Court vide order dated 22.11.2018 has dismissed the application on the premise that the petitioner has admitted her signature on the agreement. Comparison of the signature was not sought to be made with any other document. The handwriting and fingerprint expert cannot opine whether the signatures appended on blank papers were prior in point of time or subsequent thereof.

[5]. In my considered opinion, the observations given by the trial Court cannot be faulted with. According to the pleaded case of the petitioner, she has not denied her signature, rather admitted the same to be handiwork of Girdhari Lal, who used to accompany her in earlier litigation in the High Court. No such opinion can be made by examination of Handwriting and Fingerprint Expert. Even in her cross-examination, petitioner has admitted that no case of the petitioner is pending before the High Court nor there was any case pending in the High Court. In view of above the contents of the application stood contradicted

for which no explanation has been furnished by her as to how signatures of Sukchain Singh came to be appended in agreement to sell. The story advanced by the petitioner was in the context of her signing the blank papers and not by Sukhchain Singh in the presence of any witness.

[6]. In my considered opinion, the impugned order passed by the trial Court does not suffer with any error of jurisdiction or perversity of any type. This revision petition is accordingly dismissed.

January 15, 2019	(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
<i>Atik</i>	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No