


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

237

2025:PHHC:170714



**CR-3335-2025(O&M)
Date of decision: 16.01.2026**

RAJ KUMAR

..Petitioner

Versus

VINAY KASHYAP AND OTHERS

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Mayank Sharma, Advocate
Ms. Samridhi Goel, Advocate
Mr. Rajesh Bhatheja, Advocate
for respondent Nos.2 to 4.


SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The challenge in the present petition is to order dated 09.04.2025 passed by Civil Judge (Senior Division), Moga, whereby, application filed by the petitioner for rejecting the written statement dated 25.10.2024 filed by respondent Nos.2 to 4 was dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that previous written statement was filed by one Rajesh Kumar as attorney of respondent No.2 to 4 and he was asked to place on record his power of attorney which he did not. And, thereafter, the reply filed by respondent Nos.2 to 4 themselves in their personal capacity should not have been allowed.

3. He therefore prays that present appeal be allowed.

2025.PHHC:179714



4. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4 contends that respondents could always file the written statement in their personal capacity.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the impugned order with their able assistance.

6. A perusal of the impugned order shows that written statement on behalf of respondent Nos.2 to 4 was filed by one Rajesh Kumar alleging himself to be attorney of respondent Nos.2 to 4. And he was asked by the Court to file his power attorney which he could not file.

7. Thereafter, respondent Nos.2 to 4 themselves in their personal capacity filed written statement which they could file and there is no illegality in the same. Therefore, Civil Judge (Senior Division), Moga has rightly dismissed the application filed by the petitioner after considering all facts of the case.

8. In view of the same, the present revision petition is dismissed.

9. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

January 16th, 2026

Ayub/Saahil

**(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE**

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