

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

132

2024:PHHC:053801

CR-4-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.04.2024

CHARANJIT SINGH AND ANOTHER ..Petitioners

Versus

INDERJIT SINGH AND OTHERS ..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Arihant Jain, Advocate
and Mr. Kanish Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mohd. Yousaf, Advocate
for respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

1. This revision petition has been filed by the plaintiffs to assail the correctness of the interlocutory order passed by the trial Court on 11.12.2019, while dismissing their application for permission to lead additional evidence in order to produce the sale deed dated 11.05.2011, executed by Sh. Satish Kumar Singla. The application has been dismissed on the ground that the plaintiffs were aware of the sale deed and Order XVIII Rule 17A of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, stands deleted.
2. This Bench has heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the paperbook.
3. The plaintiffs have filed a suit for possession of the house, which is bounded as under:-

“North	:	House of Tarsem Lal side 32’
South	:	House of Satish Kumar side 32’ (now Veena Rani wife of Khushpal).
East	:	Road (50 foot) side 30’
West	:	House of Satish Kumar side 30’ (now Veena Rani wife of Khushpal)”

4. The sale deed sought to be produced in additional evidence is with respect to the property, which is bounded as under:-

East/Purb : Sarak 50 Foot Side 24’
South : Patwar Khana Side 56’-3’’
North : Water Works side: 61’
South : Des Raj Side: 92’

5. It is evident that the aforesaid sale deed is neither connected with the suit property nor it is with respect to the adjoining plot.

6. Hence, no ground to interfere is made out.

7. Dismissed accordingly.

8. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

April 22nd, 2024

Ay

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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