



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

(119)

CR-6650-2025

Date of Decision:-19.09.2025

BHUPINDER SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

MOHINDER SINGH AND OTHERS

... Respondents

-.-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. S.K. Kanojia, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present Civil Revision Petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, assailing the order dated 27.08.2025 (Annexure P-12), passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Hoshiarpur, whereby the applications filed by the petitioner for leading additional evidence by summoning the handwriting expert and other relevant witnesses have been dismissed.

2. The main ground for assailing the order and not leading additional evidence earlier is that the petitioner came to know about the denial of the respondent only from the cross-examination of the respondent, whereas in the impugned order, the learned Civil Judge has clearly stated that defendant No.1 in Para No.4 of the written statement has specifically denied of having made any such false statement in inquiry or appending signatures upon the same. So, the petitioner was aware of the situation that defendant has denied his signatures on the application moved before police authorities. He was required to examine Handwriting Expert, if any, while leading evidence in affirmative. He was granted approximately 30 opportunities to conclude the evidence during the



period spanning four years but no such request was made during that period of four years and when the case was fixed for arguments, the first application was moved to examine the Handwriting Expert in rebuttal evidence when the same was declined. Then another application was moved for allowing the plaintiff to lead additional evidence.

3. Upon perusal of the impugned order, I find that the learned Civil Judge has not committed any material illegality or impropriety in exercise of jurisdiction vested in him. The order does not call for any interference under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

4. Accordingly, the present Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

19.09.2025
S. Pathania

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

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