



113

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

CR-7604-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision :31.10.2025

Muthoot Fincorp Limited

...Petitioner

Versus

Mehar Singh Khokhar

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present: Mr. Bhupender Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J. (Oral)

1. Present Revision Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has been filed assailing the correctness of order dated 08.10.2025 (Annexure P-4), passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Karnal, whereby, application (Annexure P-2) filed by the plaintiff-respondent for summoning of the witness has been allowed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the plaintiff-respondent filed a suit for recovery against the defendant-petitioner-Corporation, claiming arrears of salary. It is contended that such documents had already been produced, which are again sought to be summoned by way of calling a witness of the petitioner.

3. I have considered the aforesaid submissions and perused the paper-book.

4. The trial Court has allowed the application filed by the plaintiff-respondent; permitted the plaintiff-respondent to examine the Area Manager of the defendant-Corporation; and the salary slips,



consolidated statement of gold loan, e-mails, profit & loss account statement have been ordered to be produced on record.

5. The argument raised on behalf of the petitioner that those documents are already on record appears to be factually incorrect. The petitioner, in the reply to the said application, has alleged that all the record sought by the applicant (aforesaid) is company's property and confidential in nature. These documents are considered proprietary information and fall within the scope of commercial confidentiality. The reference of the objections is there in para No.5 of the impugned order.

6. In view of the contradictory stands taken by the defendant-petitioner before the trial Court and before this Court, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief in the present petition. Moreover, the plaintiff-respondent has sought decree for recovery in the suit (Annexure P-1) wherein there is specific reference to the financial profits having been made by the defendant-Company during the tenure of plaintiff. The said plea has been specifically taken in para No.5 of the plaint. As such, permitting the plaintiff to seek aforesaid documents is in resonance with the pleadings of the parties.

7. In such circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the impugned order does not suffer from any illegality or irregularity.

8. Consequently, present petition is devoid of any merits and is accordingly dismissed.

9. However, nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the controversy.



10. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

31.10.2025
atulsethi

[HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN]
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No