



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

128

CR-5632-2025

Reserved On: 21.08.2025

Date of Decision: 15.09.2025

Gurjinder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Sahib Singh and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition is filed for setting aside order dated 21.07.2025, passed by learned Rent Controller, Ludhiana, whereby, two applications for engaging the finger print expert and to inspect the file and take photographs in rebuttal evidence and for comparison of signatures of Sh. Paramjeet Singh, have been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that applications filed by the petitioner for engaging finger print expert and to inspect file as well as for comparison of signatures of Paramjeet Singh have wrongly been dismissed.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the whole file with his able assistance.

4. It would be apposite to reproduce the relevant portion of order dated 21.07.2025, which is reproduced as under:-

“6. The plea of the petitioner is that the standard signatures of Paramjeet Singh are on the original power of



attorney which is registered document and on the court proceedings record, which are required to be compared with the disputed documents.”

7. From the perusal of record, it is adduced that in both the applications filed by the petitioner, it is adduced that the disputed documents with which standard signatures of Paramjeet Singh have to be compared have not been mentioned. Also, no reason has been explained in the said applications as to why after completion of evidence led by the petitioner and respondent, for what purpose the said witness is required. Also, no reason has been explained as to why said evidence was not lead at initial stage during the petitioner evidence. The application of the petitioner is totally vague and the absence of specific mentioning of the documents upon which signature of Paramjeet Singh have been objected, blanket permission cannot be granted.

8. It has been only mentioned in applications that signatures of Paramjeet Singh are required to be compared from original registered document i.e. power of attorney dt.02.11.2015 from lease deed dt.29.01.2014 and from original file where Paramjeet Singh put his signatures in the Court proceedings without mentioning disputed signatures/documents.

9. It is only during the course of oral arguments that Ld. Counsel for petitioner submitted that they want to compare signatures of Paramjeet Singh on receipt dt. 30.11.2018 (Ex. R2) produced by respondent in their evidence. However, no reference has been made about it in either of the two applications.

10. The said document (receipt dt. 30.11.2018), even otherwise, has been relied upon by the respondents during the provisional assessment of rent on the basis of which order dt.02.02.2023 was passed by Ld. Predecessor Court. Had petitioner had any objection with regard to the signatures upon



the said document, it was imperative upon the petitioner to seek production the said original document from respondent and prove that the said rent receipt was forged and fabricated, and the rent for the time period mentioned in the receipt is due towards the respondent. However, the same was not done. After respondents lead their evidence, and closed the same, present set of vague applications were filed.

Since, neither disputed signatures/documents have been specified, nor their necessity preference has been explained with the details as to why same was not explained during petitioner evidence, despite receipt dt. 30.11.2018 relied upon by the Ld. Predecessor of this Court for provisional assessment of rent, this Court finds not merits in the applications of petitioner. Accordingly, thus, both the applications are dismissed being vague and devoid of merits.

Now to come up on 30.07.2025 for final arguments.”

5. A perusal of the above referred to order shows that the receipt dated 30.11.2018 was relied upon by the respondent during the provisional assessment of rent on the basis of which order dated 02.02.2023 was passed by the Court. And the petitioner never objected to the signatures upon the said document at that point of time. It is after the closing of evidence that the application is moved.

6. Further the petitioner is denying the receipt of payment of rent by the respondent. And want to rebut the same by engaging a finger print expert and to inspect the file and take photograph in rebuttal evidence. There is nothing on record to show that why after completion of evidence led by the petitioner and respondent, the petitioner wants to lead the said evidence and why it was not led at the initial stage during the petitioner evidence.



7. A bare reading of impugned order dated 21.07.2025 shows that it is well-reasoned speaking order and there is no infirmity in the same, therefore, it does not require any interference by this Court. The same is therefore, upheld.

8. The present civil revision petition is ***dismissed***.

15.09.2025

Sahil

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No