

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.7830 of 2023  
Date of Decision: 13.03.2024

Nagender Singh (since deceased) through LR  
...Revisionist-Petitioner

Versus

Patwari Halqa, Village Bhondsi & others  
...Respondents

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

Present:- Ms. Apoorva Arya, Advocate, appearing for  
Mr. Neeraj Jain, Advocate,  
for the LR of the revisionist-petitioner.

\* \* \* \*

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(ORAL)

By filing the instant revision-petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the Legal Representative of the petitioner-plaintiff No.1 (here-in-after to be referred as ‘the LR of the petitioner’) has prayed for setting-aside/modifying the order (Annexure P-1) as passed by learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Sohna (for short ‘the trial Court’) on 09.08.2023 in *Civil Suit No.340 of 2015* titled as “*Nagender Singh & anr Vs. Patwari Halqa, Village Bhondsi & ors*”, to the extent so far as it pertains to the denial of the opportunity to him to lead additional evidence, even after the framing of the additional issues.

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

3. A bare perusal of the order under challenge itself reveals that while framing the additional issues in view of the application moved by none else than the plaintiffs themselves, the trial Court has categorically observed therein that the afore-referred application had been filed by them (plaintiffs) with the averment that no additional evidence was required to be adduced regarding the additional issues and the evidence, as already led by them, might be read for the same and their counsel had also re-iterated the above-discussed submissions, at Bar, before it (trial Court). In these circumstances, the LR of the petitioner has no occasion to lay challenge to the afore-said order to the extent of the observation, as made therein, to the effect that no opportunity would be afforded to any party to lead additional evidence in respect of any of the additional issues and the evidence, as recorded earlier, would be read for those issues.

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 devoid of any merit, stands dismissed.

13.03.2024

*seema*

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)  
JUDGE

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