



CR-2816-2026

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

(120)

CR-2816-2026

Date of Decision:-21.04.2026

Anil Kumar Sharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

Shiv Shakti Sharma and Others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. M.K. Bhatnagar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the impugned order dated 20.02.2026, passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Chandigarh, whereby the application filed by the petitioner/defendant No.5 for leading rebuttal evidence has been dismissed.

2. Brief facts of the case are that respondent No.1/plaintiff filed a suit for restoration of possession and damages in respect of a cabin against the petitioner and other respondents. Upon notice, the petitioner appeared before the learned trial Court and filed the written statement. Issues were framed vide order dated 24.09.2021. The plaintiff closed his evidence on 14.03.2024, and thereafter respondents No.2 to 6 closed their evidence on 30.09.2025. The case was then adjourned to 16.10.2025. On 16.10.2025, respondent No.1/plaintiff moved an application for leading rebuttal

***CR-2816-2026***

evidence, which was allowed on the same day. Subsequently, the petitioner moved an application seeking permission to lead evidence in rebuttal to the rebuttal evidence led by the plaintiff. However, the learned trial Court dismissed the said application vide impugned order dated 20.02.2026. Hence, the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner ought to have been granted an opportunity to rebut the rebuttal evidence led by respondent No.1/plaintiff, in order to effectively counter the fresh material brought on record. It is further submitted that the plaintiff examined a witness from Airtel in rebuttal, and the petitioner seeks to challenge the said evidence. It is contended that denial of such opportunity would adversely affect fair adjudication of the case. Accordingly, prayer has been made for allowing the present petition.

4. In view of the order proposed to be passed, issuance of notice to the respondents is dispensed with, as the same would unnecessarily delay the proceedings and entail additional expense.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

6. The primary grievance raised by the petitioner is regarding the right to lead evidence in rebuttal to the rebuttal evidence adduced by the plaintiff. However, when asked, learned counsel for the petitioner failed to point out any provision of law or precedent conferring such a right. Despite grant of adequate opportunity, no legal basis or supporting authority has



CR-2816-2026

been cited. It is well settled that rebuttal evidence is confined to answering the case set up by the opposite party, and the law does not contemplate a further stage of “rebuttal to rebuttal”. Permitting such a course would lead to endless prolongation of trial and defeat the principle of finality in evidence. Moreover, the present suit has been pending since the year 2017. A perusal of the record shows that the application filed by the petitioner is vague and lacks specific grounds as to what evidence is sought to be produced and for what purpose. The same appears to be an attempt to delay the proceedings.

7. In view of the above discussion, this Court finds no infirmity or perversity in the impugned order dated 20.02.2026, passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Chandigarh. Accordingly, the present Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed.

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

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

21.04.2026
Shubham

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