



130

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CR-2185-2026****Date of Decision: 09.03.2026****RAJINDER SINGH****...Petitioner****Vs.****NEELAM SINGH AND OTHERS****...Respondents****CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL**

Present: Mr. Ramesh Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, seeking to set aside the order dated 08.12.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Jalandhar, whereby the evidence of the petitioner was directed to be closed. The petitioner challenges the said order on the grounds that the same has been passed prematurely and without affording a fair opportunity to adduce the remaining evidence.

2. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the petitioner/plaintiff filed a suit for specific performance of the agreement to sell, and the respondents/defendants filed their written statement. Vide order dated 02.03.2023, the learned Trial Court framed the issues, and the matter was adjourned for the evidence of the petitioner. PW-1 Rajinder Singh was examined-in-chief on 07.07.2023, but his cross-examination was deferred, and on subsequent dates, despite the petitioner's presence, cross-examination could not be conducted. The defendants also filed an application under Section 33 of the Stamp Act for impounding the agreement, which was allowed vide



order dated 06.07.2024, presently challenged before this Hon'ble Court in Civil Revision No. 2319 of 2025 (pending for 20.04.2026, Annexure P-3). The case was further adjourned to rectify stamp duty deficiencies, but the petitioner could not impound the agreement, which was consequently precluded from being read into evidence. Ultimately, vide order dated 08.12.2025, the petitioner's evidence was closed, and his subsequent application for recalling the order was dismissed on 20.02.2026 (Annexure P-5). Aggrieved by the said order, the present revision petition has been filed.

3. I have heard counsel for the petitioner has gone through the paper-book carefully.

4. A perusal of the case history reveals that the petitioner/plaintiff was granted ample opportunities to conclude the evidence. His evidence remained pending for over two years, and on the last three dates of hearing, he failed to appear without any cogent or satisfactory explanation. In these circumstances, there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Jalandhar, which would warrant interference by this Court in the exercise of its revisional jurisdiction.

5. Considering that the testimony of the petitioner/plaintiff is of utmost importance and that his interest in the suit for specific performance of the agreement to sell would be prejudiced if he fails to submit to cross-examination, in such an eventuality, his testimony would not be read into evidence. Keeping in view the interests of justice and to enable the parties to contest the matter on its merits, the petitioner is granted one final and effective opportunity to present himself for cross-examination. This opportunity is subject to the payment of costs amounting to Rs. 50,000/-, of which Rs.



10,000/- shall be deposited in the account of the District Legal Services Authority, Jalandhar, and the remaining Rs. 40,000/- shall be paid to the respondent/defendant.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of.

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

09.03.2026

kv

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>