



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

**CR No. 4325 of 2026 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 22.05.2026**

NISHANJEET SINGH

.....PETITIONER

Vs.

M/S NANAK SHAH LALIT KUMAR

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Simranpreet Singh, Advocate,
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 02.05.2026 (Annexure P-4), passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Karnal, whereby the evidence of the petitioner-defendant has been closed by “Court order” and for grant of one effective opportunity to conclude the entire defendant evidence.

2. Brief facts of the case are that respondent-plaintiff M/s Nanak Singh Lalit Kumar filed a suit for recovery of ₹5,85,154/- along with interest against the present petitioner-defendant before the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Karnal. Upon notice, the petitioner appeared and contested the suit by filing written statement. Thereafter, vide order dated 15.04.2024 [Annexure P-3 (colly.)], the learned trial Court framed issues and the case was fixed for plaintiff evidence.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after conclusion of plaintiff evidence on 11.03.2025 [Annexure P-3 (colly.)], the case was fixed for defendant evidence and the petitioner-defendant himself was examined on 18.02.2026 [Annexure P-3 (colly.)]. He further submits that thereafter the matter was adjourned for remaining defendant evidence, however, vide impugned order dated 02.05.2026 (Annexure P-4), the learned trial Court closed the evidence of the petitioner-defendant by “Court order” while observing that sufficient opportunities had already been granted.

3.1 Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that only one effective opportunity may be granted to the petitioner to conclude his entire evidence as valuable rights of the petitioner are involved and no prejudice would be caused to the respondent in case one final opportunity is granted subject to costs.

4. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the considered opinion that issuance of notice to the respondent would unnecessarily delay the proceedings. Accordingly, issuance of notice to the respondent is dispensed with.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the paper-book.

6. Keeping in view the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner and considering the fact that valuable rights of the petitioner are involved, this Court deems it appropriate to grant one effective opportunity to the petitioner to conclude his entire evidence, subject to payment of costs.



7. Consequently, without commenting upon the actual merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 02.05.2026 (Annexure P-4) is set aside. The petitioner is directed to appear before the learned trial Court on the date already fixed, whereupon the learned trial Court shall grant one effective opportunity to the petitioner to conclude his entire evidence.

8. It is, however, made clear that the aforesaid order shall remain subject to deposit of costs of ₹10,000/- by the petitioner with the District Legal Services Authority, Karnal. A copy of the receipt regarding deposit of costs shall be produced before the learned trial Court.

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

MAY 22, 2026	(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)
nitin	JUDGE
Whether Speaking	Yes
Whether Reportable	No