

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

117

**CR-5141 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.11.2022**

Hari Ram

..Petitioner

Versus

Sukhbir and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Ms. Mamta Panwar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate
for respondent no. 1 to 3.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

The petitioner herein, is plaintiff no.2, in a suit for possession. An application for permission to lead additional evidence has been dismissed by the trial court. It may be noted here that the plaintiffs filed the suit claiming to be the co-owners/co-sharers of the property. The defendant did not dispute this fact. In para 2 of the written statement, the defendants specifically admitted that the plaintiffs are the co-owners of the property. The defendants have filed a counter claim claiming that they have become the owners of the property by the prescription of time (adverse possession).

Now the plaintiff's application, in order to permit them to examine the Registry Clerk in the additional evidence, to prove the sale deed dated 18.07.1975, has been dismissed. The said order of dismissal is challenged in the present revision.

Once the ownership of the plaintiffs is not in dispute, the trial court has correctly observed that the additional evidence sought to be led to prove the same is not relevant.

Hence, dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

November 17, 2022

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

nt

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>