



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(125)

CR-6260-2024

Date of Decision: - 28.10.2024

Raj Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

Veena Rani and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Yashveer Kharb, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the impugned order dated 09.08.2024 (Annexure P-9) passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panipat to the extent that the objections raised by the counsel for the present petitioner during the recording of evidence of PW-2 has not been dealt with in the Civil Suit case No.CS/1158/2022 titled as “Veena Rani and others Vs. Raj Kumar and others” pending before the Court of learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panipat.

2. On 29.07.2024, learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panipat had passed the following order: -

“PW2 Vimal Kant is present and examined. One more PW3 Rampal namberdar is present and examined in chief. But his cross-examination has been deferred on request of learned counsel for defendant on the ground that they have objections in the chief



examination conducted by learned counsel for plaintiff. Now, to come upon 09.08.2024 for consideration on objections.

Date of Order : 29.07.2024

*(Saru Goyal)
JMIC/CJ(JD), Panipat
UID: HR0632”*

A perusal of the above order would show that PW2 Vimal Kant was present and examined and furthermore PW3 Rampal Namberdar was present and examined in chief and it was his i.e, PW3, cross-examination which was adjourned on the request of learned counsel for the petitioner/defendant on the ground that they had objections in the chief examination. From the said zimni order, it is apparent that no request qua PW2 had been made.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present revision petition with liberty to file an appropriate application/to take up all pleas before the trial Court, during the course of trial.

4. Dismissed as withdrawn, with the aforesaid liberty.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the maintainability or merits of the said application and in case, any such application is moved, then, the same be considered independently, in accordance with law.

October 28, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No