

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

109

C.R.No.1644 of 2019

Date of decision: 16.07.2019

Ravneet Kaur

..Petitioner

Vs.

Navedita Lilly Nanda and Others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr.Sandeep Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J.(ORAL)

This revision is directed against the order passed by Ld. Civil Judge (Junior Division)-1,cum-NRI Cases/Jalandhar on 20.12.2018.

2. Vide the impugned order the application of the petitioner/plaintiff for permission to prove a photocopy of Sale agreement dated 20.07.2017 (Annexure P-2) was dismissed.

3. This Court has gone through original application itself (Annexure P-Z), in which it was averred, *"That in the present case, fixed for today, the appellant wants to prove on record a copy of agreement to sell dated 20.07.2007 as while the applicant/attorney of the plaintiff is preparing for evidence then it is transpired that original agreement to sell is not in the brief and the applicant tried to find the agreement to sell dated 20.07.2007 but it was not found"*.

4. It is, therefore, seen that it was nowhere the case of the

petitioner that original of the concerned agreement was at any time in its possession or that the same was delivered to anyone or even the petitioner's own Attorney, from whose custody it is apparently lost.

5. The learned Court below was, therefore, justified in rejecting the application after observing that the petitioner had failed to prove the existence of the original documents and also the fact that it was subsequently lost from the custody of any specified person.

6. No ground is, thus, made out to interfere with the impugned order.

7. Dismissed.

July 16, 2019
Poonam Sharma

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No