



CR-3362-2015 (O&amp;M)

-1-

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

(133)

CR-3362-2015 (O&amp;M)

Date of Decision: - 20.02.2025

Surender Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

Uma Dutt and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Suman Jain, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manoj Sharma, Advocate  
for Mr. Rajinder Goel, Advocate  
for the respondents.

\*\*\*\*

**VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**

1. Challenge in the present revision petition is to the judgment dated 22.12.2012 passed by the Rent Controller, vide which the eviction petition has been allowed and also judgment dated 19.03.2015 passed by the Appellate Authority vide which the appeal filed by the present petitioner has been dismissed.

2. On 21.02.2023, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order: -

*“Present: Mr. Suman Jain, Advocate and  
Mr. Rishabh Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. Aditya Sharma, Advocate for  
Mr. Rajinder Goel, Advocate for the respondents.*

\*\*\*\*

*Learned counsel for the respondents prays for an adjournment*



CR-3362-2015 (O&amp;M)

-2-

*on the ground that the arguing counsel for the respondents is not available today.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the issue involved in the present case is no longer res integra. The same has been settled by the Apex Court. The learned appellate authority while deciding the appeal did not decide the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC and as such on the said ground itself, the matter is liable to be remanded to the first appellate authority.*

*In the interest of justice, adjourned to 18.05.2023.*

*February 21, 2023”*

3. During the course of hearing, it could not be disputed that the first appeal has been decided by the Appellate Authority without deciding the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC.

4. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case titled as “**State of Rajasthan Vs. T. Sahani**”, ***reported as 2001(10) SCC 619*** while relying upon an earlier judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of “**K. Venkataramiah Vs. Seetharama Reddy**”, ***AIR 1963 Supreme Court 1526***, had observed that the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC should be decided along with the appeal and taking a view on the said application before hearing of the appeal was not appropriate and accordingly, the impugned order vide which challenge was made to the decision of the High Court, on the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC as well as on another application under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC, which were decided prior to deciding of the appeal was set aside and the High Court was directed to consider the appeal and the applications afresh in accordance with law. The relevant portion of the said judgment is



CR-3362-2015 (O&amp;M)

-3-

reproduced as under: -

“4. It may be pointed out that this Court as long back as in 1963 in ***K. Venkataramiah v. Seetharama Reddy, AIR 1963 Supreme Court 1526***, pointed out the scope of unamended provision of Order 41, Rule 27(c) that though there might well be cases where even though the Court found that it was able to pronounce the judgment on the state of the record as it was, and so, it could not be required additional evidence to enable it to pronounce the judgment, it still considered that in the interest of justice something which remained obscure should be filled up so that it could pronounce its judgment in a more satisfactory manner. This is entirely for the Court to consider at the time of hearing of the appeal on merits whether looking into the documents which are sought to be filed as additional evidence, need to be looked into to pronounce its judgment in a more satisfactory manner. If that be so, it is always open to be Court to look into the documents and for that purpose amended provision of Order 41, Rule 27(b), C.P.C. can be invoked. ***So the application under Order 41, Rule 27 should have been decided along with the appeal. Had the court found the documents necessary to pronounce the judgment in the appeal in a more satisfactory manner it would have allowed the same; if not, the same would have been dismissed at that stage. But taking a view on the application before hearing of the appeal, in our view would be inappropriate.....***”

5. Similarly, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the judgment dated 13.08.2009 passed in case titled as “***Surjit Kaur and another Vs. Bhupinder Singh Waraich, reported as 2009(4) RCR (Civil) 563***, had held as under: -



*“The learned counsel for the petitioners placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **M/s Eastern Equipment & Sales Ltd. v. Ing. Yash Kumar Khanna, 2008(4) RCR (Civil) 508: 2008(5) RAJ 565 : 2008(3) PLR 689**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has been pleased to lay down as under:-*

*"5. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and after considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, we are of the view that in order to decide the pending appeal in which the application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code was filed ought to have been taken by the appellate Court along with the application for acceptance of additional evidence under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code. **In that view of the matter and without going into the merits as to whether the application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code was rightly rejected by the Appellate Court as well as by the High Court, we set aside the order of the High Court as well as of the appellate Court rejecting the application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code and we direct that the appellate Court shall decide the pending appeal along with the application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code on merits within a period of three months from the date of supply of a copy of this order to the appellate court. The appeal is allowed to the extent indicated above. There will be no order as to costs.***

*6. The view that we have expressed can be supported by a decision of this Court in the case of **Jaipur Development Authority v. Kailashwati Devi, 1997(4) RCR (Civil) 97 : 1997(7) SCC 297.***

*7. We make it clear that we have not gone into the merits of the application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code which is kept open to be decided by the appellate court while deciding the appeal."*

*In view of the authoritative pronouncement by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the impugned order is set aside with a direction to the learned lower appellate Court to consider the application for*



CR-3362-2015 (O&amp;M)

-5-

*additional evidence along with the main appeal, at the time of arguments.”*

6. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances and the law laid down in the above-said judgments, the present revision petition is partly allowed and the impugned order dated 19.03.2015 is set aside and the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Court is directed to decide the main appeal alongwith the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC filed for additional evidence.

7. It would be relevant to mention that this Court has not considered the merits of the case and the present order has been passed only on account of the fact that the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC has not been decided by the Appellate Authority while deciding the main appeal. It would be open to both the parties to raise all pleas in the main appeal as well as in the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC and the Appellate Authority would decide the same independently, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

8. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of in view of the above-said order.

**February 20, 2025**  
*naresh.k*

**( VIKAS BAHL )**  
**JUDGE**

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