



CR-5857-2022 (O&M)

-1-

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

(302)

CR-5857-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: - 28.04.2026

Lovepreet Singh and another

....Petitioners

Versus

Sawinder Kaur and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Ramesh Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. B.S. Jaswal, Advocate
for LR of respondent No.1 and respondent No.2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**CM-8406-CII-2024**

1. Present application has been filed under Order 22 Rule 4 CPC read with Section 151 CPC for impleading legal heirs of respondent No.1.
2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, which is duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed, subject to all just exceptions and the person detailed in para No.2 of the application is ordered to be impleaded as legal representative of respondent No.1. The amended memo of parties is taken on record.
3. It is clarified that this Court has not adjudicated upon the right of the estate of respondent No.1 and the legal representative has

**CR-5857-2022 (O&M)****-2-**

been impleaded only to pursue the present revision petition.

CR-5857-2022

1. Present civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for quashing the impugned order dated 16.11.2022 (Annexure P-33) passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Amritsar, whereby the evidence of the plaintiffs/petitioners has been closed by Court order.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in the present case, the petitioners had filed a suit for declaration as well as for rendition of accounts and thus, the delay in the proceedings would primarily prejudice the petitioners/plaintiffs. It is further submitted that the petitioners have already examined two witnesses and further wish to examine two more witnesses, who are officials and for the same they have deposited diet money and although the summons were issued to the said witnesses also however they did not appear. It is stated that at any rate, the petitioners would now restrict their prayer to grant of two effective opportunities to lead their entire evidence. It is submitted that the order dated 16.11.2022 (Annexure P-33), vide which the evidence of the petitioners has been closed, be set aside.

3. Learned counsel appearing for LR's of contesting respondents No.1 and 2 has submitted that the issues in the present case was framed on 17.09.2018 and several opportunities had already been given to the plaintiffs to lead their entire evidence. It is argued that in case any opportunity is to be granted, then, the same should be subject to



heavy cost and also on the condition that the petitioners/plaintiffs should lead their entire evidence at their own responsibility without taking the Court's help as several years have already elapsed as the suit is of the year 2014.

4. Notices were issued in the present case by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court to respondents No.1, 2, 23 and 24 only, as other respondents were ex-parte before the trial Court. Respondents No.23 and 24 were duly served, however, none has appeared on their behalf to oppose the present revision petition.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners, in view of the objections on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2, has submitted that the petitioners are ready to pay reasonable cost and has further submitted that two effective opportunities be granted to the petitioners to lead their entire evidence at their own responsibility.

6. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances and the fair stand taken on behalf of the petitioners as well as by learned counsel for the respondents No.1 and 2, the present revision petition is partly allowed and the impugned order dated 16.11.2022 (Annexure P-33) is set aside to the extent that the evidence of the petitioners/plaintiffs has been closed by order and the petitioners are granted two effective opportunities, at their own responsibility, to lead their entire evidence, subject to the petitioners depositing an amount of Rs.30,000/- as cost, within a period of 15 days from today and on their depositing the said amount, Rs.20,000/- would be released by the trial Court to legal



representative of respondent No.1 and respondent No.2 as they have contested the present revision petition and an amount of Rs.10,000/- would be paid to respondents No.23 and 24 in equal proportions i.e. Rs.5,000/- each.

7. It is made clear that in case, the petitioners do not deposit the costs of Rs.30,000/- within a period of 15 days from today, the present revision petition would be deemed to have been dismissed.

April 28, 2026
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No