



CR-6815-2024

-1-

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

(123)

CR-6815-2024

Date of Decision: - 22.11.2024

Neetu and others

....Petitioners

Versus

Shrawan Bishnoi and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Madhup Munjal, Advocate, and
Mr. Rajat Dogra, Advocate
for the petitioners.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 11.11.2024 passed by the MACT, Ferozepur vide which the evidence of the petitioners/claimants has been closed by Court order.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are the widow and two minor children of the deceased Sukhwinder Singh, who died in an accident and the present claim petition has been filed by the petitioners for seeking compensation on account of the said death. It is further submitted that the issues in the present case were framed on 19.09.2024 and although, petitioner No.1 herself has been examined, but two other witnesses, who are essential for the proper adjudication of the case, could not be examined by petitioner No.1 on

**CR-6815-2024****-2-**

account of the fact that she had to take care of her two minor children and that she is mentally shocked by the sudden death of her husband and is also undergoing treatment by the doctor of Banger Superspeciality Hospital with regard to lower back ache radiating to her left leg. It is stated that in case, the petitioners are not granted adequate opportunities to lead their entire evidence, then, they would suffer irreparable loss. It is further stated that for the delay caused in the proceedings, the petitioners are ready to pay adequate costs.

3. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioners should be granted two effective opportunities to conclude their entire evidence and accordingly, the present revision petition is partly allowed and the impugned order dated 11.11.2024 is set aside to the extent that the evidence of the petitioners has been closed by Court order and the petitioners are granted two effective opportunities to conclude their entire evidence and the same would be subject to the petitioners depositing the cost of Rs.10,000/- within a period of 10 days from today. On depositing the said amount, the same would be released by the concerned Court to respondent Nos.1 and 2 in equal proportions, i.e., Rs.5,000/- each.

4. It is made clear that in case, the said cost is not deposited by the petitioners till the said date, the present revision petition would be deemed to have been dismissed.

5. It would be relevant to mention that notice of motion has not been issued to respondent Nos.1 and 2 as issuance of any notice would

further delay the proceedings in the petition and would also entail expenses for respondent Nos.1 and 2 in order to defend the present petition. However, it would be open to respondent Nos.1 and 2 to move an application for recalling the present order in case, any of the statement made before this Court is found to be false/incorrect.

November 22, 2024

naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No