

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH****122****CR-7723-2025 (O&M)****Date of decision: 12.11.2025****Rinki @ Rinkey****...Petitioner(s)****Vs.****Meena Devi****...Respondent(s)****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA**

Present:- Mr. Himanshu Joshi, Advocate for the petitioner.

*********NIDHI GUPTA, J.**

Present Civil Revision Petition under Article 227 of Constitution of India has been filed by the plaintiff seeking setting aside of the order dated 31.07.2025 (Annexure P-2) passed by learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Narnaul; whereby application dated 14.11.2022 (Annexure P-1) filed by the petitioner to lead additional evidence, has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the power to allow additional evidence is discretionary and should be exercised to advance cause of justice. Technicalities should not override substantive justice. Irreparable loss and grave prejudice shall be caused to the petitioner in case the petitioner is not allowed to lead additional evidence.



3. It is accordingly prayed that the present Civil Revision Petition be allowed; and the impugned order dated 31.07.2025 be set aside.

4. No other argument is raised on behalf of the petitioner. I have heard learned counsel and perused the case file in detail. I find no merit in the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner.

5. Perusal of the record of the case shows that the petitioner has filed the Civil Suit on 16.10.2017. Five years thereafter, on 14.11.2022, the petitioner moved the instant application to lead additional evidence (Annexure P-1) as the petitioner had wanted to examine 2 more witnesses - the same being Rajender Saini to prove the site map; and Reader to prove the attendance affidavit dated 16.02.2015.

6. The record reveals that on 14.11.2022, the said witnesses had duly appeared before learned Trial Court, but their examination could not be conducted. It is not disputed that the petitioner has availed 25 effective opportunities to lead evidence during which time petitioner had examined only six witnesses. Accordingly, on 27.10.2022, evidence of the petitioner had been closed by Court order; whereafter he had filed the present application on 14.11.2022. It has been found by the Trial Court that petitioner has filed instant application only to fill up the lacuna in the present case.

7. Learned counsel for the plaintiff is unable to dispel the findings/observations of the learned Trial Court in the impugned order.



8. In this view of the matter, no ground is made out to set aside the impugned order dated 31.07.2025. The present Civil Revision Petition is accordingly **dismissed**.

9. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

12.11.2025

Divyanshi

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No