

**CR No.2068 of 2022****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

202

Civil Revision No.2068 of 2022
Date of decision: March 10th, 2026

Balwinder Sooch through her SPA Jatinder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

Puneet Kaur and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHLPresent: Mr. Ajiteshwar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.Mr. Sunil Garg, Advocate
for the respondents.**VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**

1. This is a civil revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 22.02.2022 passed by Civil Judge (Junior Division), Jalandhar, vide which the application under Order VI Rule 16 CPC filed by the defendants has been allowed.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that a perusal of the impugned order would show that the plaint in question has been sealed and the plaintiff has been given the right to file a fresh plaint containing the exact dispute excluding the chat between the plaintiff's son and respondent No.1. It is submitted that thus no prejudice has been caused to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the aspect that there is a chat and as per the chat, it is defendant No.1 who has backtracked from the marriage as per the case of the plaintiff may be



CR No.2068 of 2022

2

permitted to be pleaded. It is submitted that in the said circumstances, the petitioner would not give the details of the chat.

4. During the course of arguments, a very fair stand has been taken by the counsel for the petitioner as well as counsel for the respondents and in view of the fair stand and on consensus, present petition is disposed of and the impugned order is upheld with the following observations/clarifications:

- (i) As has been permitted vide the impugned order, it would be open to the petitioner to file a fresh plaint. The fresh plaint would be deemed to have been instituted on the date when the original plaint was filed. In the plaint, no chat as propounded by the plaintiff would be reproduced. It would be open to the plaintiff to mention in the plaint that there was a chat between the son of the plaintiff and defendant No.1 as it is the case of the plaintiff that it is defendant No.1 who has backtracked from the marriage.
- (ii) It would be open to the defendants to rebut the averments made in the plaint including the averments on the abovesaid aspect.
- (iii) Both the parties would make pleadings bringing out their case without writing anything scandalous against each other.

March 10th, 2026
Puneet

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No