

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.7152 of 2023

Date of Decision: 29.11.2023

Naresh Kumar and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Hoshiar Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: ***HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA***

Present:- Mr. Saransh Sabharwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (Oral)

By way of the instant revision petition, the petitioners-plaintiffs No.1 and 2 (here-in-after to be referred as 'the petitioners') have invoked the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to lay challenge to the order as passed by learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Panchkula (for short 'the trial Court') on 11.10.2023 in **Civil Suit No.360 of 2020** titled as '*Naresh Kumar and others vs. Hoshiar Singh etc*', whereby their evidence has been closed while observing that they had failed to conclude the same despite availing several opportunities for this purpose.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners in the present revision petition, at the preliminary stage and have also gone through the file carefully.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners could not conclude their evidence in the above-referred Civil Suit due to some unavoidable circumstances and vide the impugned order, the trial Court has

erroneously declined the request, as made by their counsel for granting further adjournment for the afore-said purpose and therefore, the said order is not legally sustainable and deserves to be set-aside.

4. However, the above-raised contention is bereft of any force because as is explicit from Annexure P-4, the issues were framed in the afore-mentioned Civil Suit on 27.04.2022. A bare perusal of Annexure P-7 (Colly), i.e the copies of the Case Status Report and the '*zimni*' orders passed in the said Suit, reveals that the petitioners and proforma respondent No.3-plaintiff No.3 had been afforded as many as 11 (eleven) effective opportunities to adduce and conclude their evidence before the closure of the same vide the impugned order. In these circumstances, no cogent ground is made out to afford any further opportunity to the petitioners for the above-said purpose.

5. As a sequel to the fore-going discussion, it follows that the impugned order does not suffer from any illegality, infirmity, irregularity or perversity, so as to call for any interference by this Court. Resultantly, the revision petition in hand, being *sans* any merit, stands dismissed.

29.11.2023
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

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