

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

**CR No. 820 of 2023  
Date of decision: 07.02.2023**

Manjit Kaur ..... Petitioner.

Versus

Kuljit Singh and others .... Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. N.S. Diwana, Advocate, for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 17.12.2022 passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division), SAS Nagar (Mohali) whereby her application for leading further evidence in rebuttal has been declined.

Learned counsel for the petitioner/plaintiff submits that he wants only an opportunity to examine two witnesses, who were witnesses to the agreements Ex. P1 and Ex. D1.

Heard.

The petitioner/plaintiff has filed a suit for recovery of ₹40,00,000/-, i.e. double of the earnest money, which she is stated to have paid to the respondents/defendants for execution of the sale deed. The parties have already led their evidence. The petitioner/plaintiff, in her evidence, has relied upon Ex. P1, which is an agreement to sell dated 16.05.2011, but she was cross-examined wherein she has admitted that the second agreement dated 16.05.2011 (Ex. D1) had been substituted. She has also pleaded that both the agreements are identical, but para No. 5 of the first agreement

(Ex.P1) had been deleted from the second agreement (Ex. D1). The petitioner/plaintiff herself admitted the agreements (Ex. P1 and Ex. D1), therefore, I do not find any infirmity in the impugned order declining an opportunity to examine the witnesses in support of the agreements.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**07.02.2023**  
Ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No