

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.7605 of 2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 14.02.2024

Mohan Singh @ Mohan Dass

...Revisionist-petitioner.

Versus

Ajmer Singh

...Respondent.

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

Present:- Mr. Narinder S. Lucky, Advocate
for the revisionist-petitioner.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (Oral)

Feeling aggrieved by the order passed by learned Civil Judge (Senior Division), Barnala (for short 'the trial Court') on 15.09.2023 in the ***Civil Suit No.1402-2022*** titled as '***Ajmer Singh versus Mohan Singh***', whereby the application (Annexure P-2) moved by the petitioner-defendant (here-in-after to be referred as 'the defendant') with the prayer to allow the Hand-writing and Documents Expert named Mr. Inderjit Singh to inspect the judicial file and to take the photographs of the documents, has been dismissed, he (defendant) has preferred the instant revision-petition to lay challenge to the same.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner-defendant in the present revision-petition, at the preliminary stage and have also perused the file carefully.

3. A bare perusal of the afore-referred application, i.e Annexure P-2, reveals that throughout therein, the defendant has neither specified the

detail of the documents, as sought to be photographed by the above-named Expert nor the purpose/requirement for the same. Rather, the trial Court has categorically mentioned in the impugned order itself that in his written-statement, he (defendant) has taken the plea that the alleged Pronote and Receipt were actually meant to be kept as security but these were misused by the respondent-plaintiff and thus, he had admitted his signatures on the afore-said documents and he had also failed to lead any evidence despite having availed more than 10 (ten) opportunities for this purpose.

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

14.02.2024
pooja

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

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