



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

**CR No. 2440 of 2026 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 16.03.2026**

**M/S G-NEXT MEDIA (PTC NEW) THROUGH HARPREET SINGH
.....PETITIONER**

Vs.

SH. SUKHDIAL SINGH BHULLAR IPS (RETD.) AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

**Present: Mr. Saurav Bhatia & Mr. Arshsdeep Singh Kler, Advocates,
for the petitioner.**

AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL, J.(ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is for setting aside the impugned order dated 19.02.2026 (Annexure P-5), passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division)-I, SAS Nagar (Mohali), in Civil Suit No. CS/574/2021 titled as '*Sukhdial Singh Bhullar vs. M/s G-Next Media (PTC News) and others*', instituted on 26.07.2021, whereby the evidence of the petitioner/defendant No. 1 has been closed without affording reasonable opportunity to lead evidence.

2. Brief facts of the case are that respondent No. 1 – Sukhdial Singh Bhullar, has filed a suit for recovery of ₹40,00,000/- against the present petitioner and others on account of damages along with interest. Notice of the suit was issued to the present petitioner and others, who appeared through counsel and filed their written statement. From the



pleadings of the parties, as many as five issues were framed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), SAS Nagar, vide order dated 22.09.2022 (Annexure P-3). Thereafter, the respondent-plaintiff led his evidence and closed the same on 16.05.2025. Thereafter, the case was fixed for evidence of the petitioner-defendant. The petitioner sought some adjournments for leading evidence but failed to conclude the same.

2.1 In the impugned order dated 19.02.2026 (Annexure P-5), it has been held by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division)-1, SAS Nagar that the present petitioner had availed numerous opportunities, including the last opportunity, but failed to conclude its evidence and no justification was made for further adjournment of the case. Consequently, the evidence of the defendant was closed “by order” of the Court and the case was fixed for rebuttal evidence, if any, as well as for arguments.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the plaintiff-respondent No. 1 had availed more than 2½ years to conclude his evidence, whereas the present petitioner was never granted a proper opportunity to conclude the entire evidence.

3.1 It is further submitted that the petitioner may be granted an opportunity to conclude its evidence before the learned trial Court for proper adjudication of the case, as the valuable rights of the petitioner are involved in getting the suit decided.

4. In view of the facts of the present case, this Court feels that issuance of notice to the respondents would unnecessarily delay the proceedings. Accordingly, issuance of notice to the respondents is dispensed with.



5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant one effective opportunity to the petitioner-defendant to conclude its evidence.
6. Consequently, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 19.02.2026 (Annexure P-5) is set aside. The petitioner is granted one more effective opportunity to conclude its evidence. The petitioner is directed to appear before the learned trial Court on the date fixed, whereupon the learned trial Court shall grant the petitioner one effective opportunity to conclude its evidence.
7. However, it is made clear that the aforesaid order shall be subject to payment of costs of ₹5,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner with the District Legal Services Authority, SAS Nagar (Mohali). A copy of the receipt of the costs shall be produced before the learned trial Court.
8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

MARCH 16, 2026

nitin

Whether Speaking

Whether Reportable

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)

JUDGE

Yes

No