



CR-4173-2026

1

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

128

CR-4173-2026

Date of decision: 18.05.2026

Neeraj Jindal

...Petitioner

Versus

Sahil Makkar and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Ritender Rathee, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. TThe present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, 1950, for setting aside the impugned order dated 14.10.2025 (Annexure P-5) passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panipat, in Civil Suit No. CS-515-2022 titled “Neeraj Jindal versus Sahil Makkar and others”, whereby the evidence of the plaintiff-petitioner has been closed.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner–Neeraj Jindal had filed a suit for recovery of Rs.7,06,029/- along with pendente lite interest against the respondents–Sahil Makkar and another. Notice of the said suit was issued to the respondents/defendants, who contested the same by filing their written statement. Thereafter, issues were framed and the case was fixed for the evidence of the petitioner/plaintiff. The petitioner tendered his affidavit and thereafter, the case was fixed for his cross-examination. A perusal of the interim orders passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panipat, reveals that the petitioner was present and was partly examined, whereas his



CR-4173-2026

2

14.10.2025, it was observed that no PW was present and that several opportunities had already been granted to the petitioner/plaintiff to conclude his evidence, but he had failed to do so and there is no justification to further adjourn the matter for plaintiff evidence. Accordingly, the evidence of the petitioner/plaintiff was closed by order of the Court and the case was fixed for the evidence of the respondents/defendants.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the present petitioner could not conclude his evidence before the learned trial Court on account of the fact that the case had been transferred from one Court to another. He further contends that since valuable rights of the petitioner are involved in the adjudication of the suit, the petitioner may be granted one effective opportunity to conclude his entire evidence.

4. Considering the limited nature of relief sought, issuance of notice to the respondents is dispensed with, as the same would only result in further delay in the proceedings.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have perused the paper book with his able assistance.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, without commenting upon the merits of the case, and considering the fact that the valuable rights of the petitioner are involved in the matter, one effective opportunity deserves to be granted to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present revision petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 14.10.2025 (Annexure P-5) is set aside. The petitioner is directed to appear before the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panipat, on the date already fixed and thereafter, the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panipat, is directed to



CR-4173-2026

3

grant one effective opportunity to the petitioner/plaintiff to conclude his entire evidence, subject to payment of Rs.5,000/- as costs to be deposited with the concerned District Legal Services Authority.

7. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

May 18, 2026
anil

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No
Whether reportable : Yes / No