



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

201

**RSA-4293-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : 17.11.2025**

Union of India and others

..... Appellants

versus

M/s. Computer Component Centre

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate and
Mr. Lalit Attri, Advocate
for the appellants.

None for the respondent.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. Defendants are in appeals aggrieved of the judgment and decree passed by the Courts below.
2. Plaintiff filed suit seeking recovery of Rs.1,36,226/- based based upon invoices, ledger account and the receipts regarding supply of material against the invoices.
3. The suit was contested by the defendants alleging non supply of the material and claiming that the receipts claimed by the plaintiff are forged and fabricated.
4. Plaintiff, in support of his claim, proved copy of supply order dated 09.05.2011 as Ex.P5, invoice No.33 Ex.P6, invoice No.35 Ex.P7 and Ex.P27, copies of ledger account Ex.P12 to P14, copy of



invoice No.33 Ex.P23, contingent bill Ex.P24, copy of contingent bill Ex.P28 along with sanction accorded by CFA Ex.P25 and P29.

5. The Courts below after analysing evidence, found that the specific plea raised by the defendants regarding forgery and fabrication of the documents remained unproved, as no evidence was led. Plaintiff having proved the copy of supply order, invoices, account statements and even the sanction from CFA, was entitled for recovery.

6. Counsel for the appellants has assailed the findings recorded by the Courts below. He submits that the plaintiff cannot take benefit of the weakness of the case of the defendants. Once the defendants had denied supply of the material, it was for the plaintiff to prove the same.

7. Having heard counsel for the appellants and after carefully perusing the records of the case, this Court finds that the plea raised by counsel for the appellants is misconceived. Original bills Ex.P4 and Ex.P5 have come on record. Ex.P6 and P7 are the invoices against the aforesaid bills. The stand of the defendants-appellants regarding the same being forged and fabricated, remains unproved. No cogent evidence was led by defendants to prove their stand.

8. Pure finding of facts have been recorded by the Courts below. Counsel for the appellants has not been able to point out any evidence that has gone unread or without consideration to bring the findings within the realm of perversity.

9. Finding no merit in the present appeal, the same is ordered to be dismissed.



10. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

17.11.2025
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No