



Sr. No.203

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

CR No.5092 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of decision: 26.05.2026

Manohar Lal Mulwani

...Petitioner

Versus

The Punjab State Cooperative Agricultural Development Bank Ltd.

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Akshay Bhan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Santosh Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Divanshu Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tushar Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Shourya Arora, Advocate for the respondent.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a revision petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 19.07.2012 passed by the Appellate Authority, Chandigarh, vide which the Appellate Authority had allowed the application for additional evidence filed by the respondent.

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there are several grounds on which the impugned order deserves to be set aside. It is submitted that the primary ground on which the application deserves to be set aside is that although, application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC has been decided but the main appeal has been adjourned and has not been decided along with the said application. It is further submitted that it



has repeatedly been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and by this Court that the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC has to be decided alongwith the main appeal.

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondent has submitted that in case the impugned order is to be set aside on the said aspect, the same should not be construed as an expression on the merits of the application and the application should be considered by the Court independently at the time of deciding the main appeal. Learned counsel for the respondent has further pointed out that in the present case, the present petitioner, who had initially filed the present revision petition i.e. Manohar Lal, has died and one Vijay Kumar Mulwani, who is his brother, is wanting his impleadment as LR in the proceedings. It is submitted that the respondent wishes to oppose the said application and the said aspect be kept open for the respondent, in case, application is filed on behalf of the petitioner to implead the said brother as his legal representative before the First Appellate Authority.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that since the said aspect is being kept open, opportunity be also granted to the petitioner to raise all the pleas before the First Appellate Authority.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and has perused the paper-book.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case titled as “**State of Rajasthan Vs. T. Sahani**”, reported as **2001(10) SCC 619** while relying upon an earlier judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of “**K. Venkataramiah Vs. Seetharama Reddy**”, **AIR 1963 SC 1526**, had observed



that the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC should be decided along with the appeal and taking a view on the said application before hearing of the appeal was not appropriate and accordingly, the impugned order vide which challenge was made to the decision of the High Court, on the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC as well as on another application under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC, which were decided prior to deciding of the appeal was set aside and the High Court was directed to consider the appeal and the applications afresh in accordance with law. The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced as under: -

*“4. It may be pointed out that this Court as long back as in 1963 in **K. Venkataramiah v. Seetharama Reddy, AIR 1963 Supreme Court 1526**, pointed out the scope of unamended provision of Order 41, Rule 27(c) that though there might well be cases where even though the Court found that it was able to pronounce the judgment on the state of the record as it was, and so, it could not be required additional evidence to enable it to pronounce the judgment, it still considered that in the interest of justice something which remained obscure should be filled up so that it could pronounce its judgment in a more satisfactory manner. This is entirely for the Court to consider at the time of hearing of the appeal on merits whether looking into the documents which are sought to be filed as additional evidence, need to be looked into to pronounce its judgment in a more satisfactory manner. If that be so, it is always open to be Court to look into the documents and for that purpose amended provision of Order 41, Rule 27(b), C.P.C. can be invoked. **So the application under Order 41, Rule 27 should have been decided along with the appeal. Had the court found the documents necessary to pronounce the judgment in the appeal in a more satisfactory manner it would have***



allowed the same; if not, the same would have been dismissed at that stage. But taking a view on the application before hearing of the appeal, in our view would be inappropriate.....”

7. Similarly, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the judgment dated 13.08.2009 passed in case titled as “**Surjit Kaur and another Vs. Bhupinder Singh Waraich**, reported as **2009(4) RCR (Civil) 563**, had held as under: -

*“The learned counsel for the petitioners placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **M/s Eastern Equipment & Sales Ltd. v. Ing. Yash Kumar Khanna, 2008(4) RCR (Civil) 508: 2008(5) RAJ 565 : 2008(3) PLR 689**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has been pleased to lay down as under:-*

*"5. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and after considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, we are of the view that in order to decide the pending appeal in which the application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code was filed ought to have been taken by the appellate Court along with the application for acceptance of additional evidence under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code. **In that view of the matter and without going into the merits as to whether the application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code was rightly rejected by the Appellate Court as well as by the High Court, we set aside the order of the High Court as well as of the appellate Court rejecting the application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code and we direct that the appellate Court shall decide the pending appeal along with the application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code on merits within a period of three months from the date of supply of a***



copy of this order to the appellate court. The appeal is allowed to the extent indicated above. There will be no order as to costs.

*6. The view that we have expressed can be supported by a decision of this Court in the case of **Jaipur Development Authority v. Kailashwati Devi, 1997(4) RCR (Civil) 97 : 1997(7) SCC 297.***

7. We make it clear that we have not gone into the merits of the application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Civil Procedure Code which is kept open to be decided by the appellate court while deciding the appeal."

In view of the authoritative pronouncement by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the impugned order is set aside with a direction to the learned lower appellate Court to consider the application for additional evidence along with the main appeal, at the time of arguments."

8. In the present case, it is not in dispute that the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC read with Section 151 CPC has been decided by the First Appellate Authority prior to deciding the main appeal, thus, the impugned order dated 19.07.2012 deserves to be set aside on the said short point alone.

9. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances and the law laid down in the above-said judgments, the present revision petition is partly allowed and the impugned order dated 19.07.2012 is set aside and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC read with Section 151 CPC for additional evidence afresh along with the main appeal and at the time of deciding of the main appeal.

10. It would be relevant to mention that this Court has not



considered the merits of the application filed under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC nor has set aside the impugned order upon merits and the same has been set aside only on the short ground mentioned hereinabove and thus, the First Appellate Authority would decide the appeal alongwith the application under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC together, on merits.

11. It is clarified that this Court has not opined with respect to the aspect as to whether Vijay Kumar Mulwani, who is stated to be the brother of Manohar Lal, would be entitled to be impleaded as legal representative of Manohar Lal before the First Appellate Authority or not. In case, any such application for impleadment is filed, it would be open to both the parties to raise all the pleas in accordance with law and the First Appellate Authority would consider the same independently, in accordance with law.

12. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

26.05.2026

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No

Yes/No