

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Civil Revision No. 957 of 2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 21.03.2022

Sudhir Kumar Verma

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Jagmohan Passi

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. The impugned order was passed on 08.11.2019. The petitioner's right to file reply to the counter-claim was ordered to be forfeited vide order dated 08.11.2019. The learned counsel representing the petitioner admits that after recording some evidence, the petitioners' evidence has also been closed.

2. At this stage, it would not be appropriate to entertain the revision petition, particularly when it has been filed after a period of 2½ years from the date of the passing of the impugned order. Furthermore, the petitioner, who is a plaintiff before the trial Court, has already disclosed his stand by filing the suit for grant of decree for specific performance of the agreement to sell. The defendant claims that there is no agreement to sell and the document was, in fact, mortgage deed. The stand of the petitioner is already before the trial Court, hence, the petitioner shall not suffer any

prejudice. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

3. The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

March 21, 2022
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No