



**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh**

**Civil Revision No. 58 of 2025**

**Date of Decision: 31.01.2025**

Ravinder Pal Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Jagatjit Singh Sodhi and Others

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.**

Present: Mr. Vishal Garg, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

**Anil Kshetarpal, J.**

1. On 13.01.2025, the following order was passed:-

“1. On 10.01.2025, the following order was passed:-

*“Learned counsel representing the petitioner while drawing the attention of the Court to the orders passed on 13.03.2024, 24.04.2024, 18.07.2024 and 07.08.2024, submits that the trial court has erred in assuming that the counsel representing defendant no.1 is delaying the disposal of the case. He submits that counsel representing defendant no.1 cooperated with the court and never sought adjournment. It was the plaintiff who did not produce evidence despite 15 opportunities, as recorded in the order dated 24.04.2024.*

*The attention of this Court has been drawn to the fact that the plaintiff belongs to Canada. He admits that*

*the plaintiff has already returned to Canada, however, he submits that he is prepared to cross-examine the witness through video conferencing. There are as many as three defendants including Haryana Urban Development Authority (now Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran Nigam). He prays for some time to get proper instructions.*

*List on 13.01.2025, in the urgent list.”*

2. *The learned counsel representing the petitioner has informed the court that the plaintiff filed an application for permitting defendant no.3 to cross-examine him by permitting the plaintiff to appear virtually from Canada. However, the same has been dismissed by the trial court and an opportunity to cross-examine defendant no.3 has also been closed.*

*Notice of motion.*

*The petitioner shall have the liberty to serve the plaintiff through his counsel in the trial court, for 31.01.2025.*

*Dasti only.*

*To be listed in the urgent list.*

*In the meantime, the trial court is requested to adjourn the case beyond the date fixed by this court.”*

2. Mr. Sunidh Kashyap, Advocate, has entered appearance for the respondent No.1. He submits that the petitioner’s counsel in the Trial Court did not come forward to cross-examine the plaintiff, who was in India for nearly about 40 days.

3. This Court has considered all aspects of the matter. The correctness of the facts recorded in the order dated 10.01.2025 is not disputed.

4. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the petitioner's counsel in the Trial Court is permitted to complete the cross-examination of the plaintiff through video conferencing. Such an opportunity shall be granted subject to payment of cost of ₹5,000/-. Accordingly, the impugned order shall stand modified and the present revision petition is disposed of.

**(Anil Kshetarpal)**  
**Judge**

**January 31, 2025**  
**"DK"**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No