



142

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-4631-2025

Date of decision: 11.08.2025

Gagandeep Singh Gill

...Petitioner

Versus

Navneet Sharma and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Peeush Gagneja, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Arora, Advocate for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a revision petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside/quashing the order dated 23.05.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by the trial Court in case CS/1040/2020, titled as “Navneet Sharma Vs. Nirlaip Kaur and others”, whereby application for amendment under Order VI Rule 17 of CPC has been allowed.

2. On 22.07.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Present:- Mr. Peeush Gagneja, Advocate for the petitioner.

*Inter alia contends that the petitioner would be satisfied in case the petitioner is granted liberty to lead evidence on the additional pleas raised by the **petitioner** in the plaint subsequent to the order allowing the amendment.*

Notice of motion to respondents no.1 and 2 only, who as per the case of the petitioner, are contesting parties and are the plaintiffs, for 28.07.2025.

Liberty is granted to the petitioner to serve respondents no.1 and 2 through dasti process as well as through the



counsel in the trial Court.

To be taken up in the urgent list.

July 22, 2025.”

3. Apparently, in the third line of the above order, it has been inadvertently mentioned that the additional pleas were raised by the petitioner whereas instead of word “***petitioner***”, it should have been mentioned as “***plaintiffs***”.

4. Both the counsel are unanimous on the said aspect.

5. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2 has submitted that in case the petitioner is granted the said liberty, then liberty be also granted to respondent Nos.1 and 2 to rebut the evidence to be led by the petitioner with respect to the additional plea taken in the plaint.

6. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances and the fair stand taken by learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2, the present revision petition is disposed of while upholding the order dated 23.05.2025 with the following directions:-

a) It would be open to the petitioner to lead evidence with respect to the additional pleas raised by the plaintiff by virtue of the amendment which has been allowed. For the said purpose, one effective opportunity would be given.

b) It would also be open to respondent Nos.1 and 2-plaintiffs to lead evidence in rebuttal to the evidence led by the petitioner under direction (a). For the said purpose also, one effective opportunity would be given.

c) In case the petitioner does not wish to lead any evidence then no further evidence would be led by respondent Nos.1 and 2-plaintiffs as in para 16 of the impugned order, it had been observed that the plaintiff had already stated that he will not lead any further evidence except for placing on record the certified copy of the sale deed.

11.08.2025

Pawan

Whether speaking/reasoned:-
Whether reportable:-

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No