

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.7225 of 2023
Date of Decision: 14.03.2024

Maninder Singh & others
...Revisionists-Petitioners
Versus
Satnam Singh & others
...Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. C.L. Sharma, Advocate,
for the revisionists-petitioners.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

By filing the instant revision-petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners-plaintiffs (here-in-after to be referred as ‘the plaintiffs’) have laid challenge the order (Annexure P-2) passed by learned Additional Civil Judge (Sr. Division), Hoshiarpur (for short ‘the trial Court’) on 04.09.2023 in *Civil Suit No.662 of 2019* titled as “*Maninder Singh & ors versus Satnam Singh & ors*”, whereby their evidence has been closed while observing that their witness had not appeared in the Court despite the fact that the last opportunity had been granted for this purpose.

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

3. Learned counsel for the plaintiffs contends that due to some unavoidable circumstances, the plaintiffs could not conclude their evidence in the above-referred Civil Suit, well in time and therefore, they deserve to be granted reasonable opportunity for the afore-said purpose.

3. However, the above-raised contention does not hold much water because a bare perusal of the file reveals that the trial Court had framed the issues in the afore-mentioned Civil Suit on 11.12.2019 and thereafter, as many as 14 effective opportunities had been afforded to the plaintiffs for concluding their evidence which, in the considered opinion of this Court, are more than sufficient and it being so, no cogent ground is made out to grant any further opportunity to them for the above-said purpose.

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

14.03.2024
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*
Whether Reportable: *No*