



133

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

CR-844-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 18.02.2026

Ms Alexandra Skinner & Ors

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

The Hisar Indian Coop. House Building Society Ltd & Ors ... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Sarun Hansa, Advocate for the petitioners.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India challenging the order dated 19.10.2023 (Annexure P-1) whereby the application filed by the petitioners for summoning of original record of the Hisar Indian Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., Hisar (respondent No.1 herein) has been dismissed.

2. Brief facts relevant to the present *lis* are that the plaintiff-petitioners herein filed a suit for permanent injunction as well as prohibitory injunction for restraining the defendant-respondents from selling, leasing, gifting, mortgaging, exchanging or entering into any release deed or specific numbers without getting the same partitioned. It was also prayed that the defendant-respondents be restrained from allotting the membership cards of specific portion of the land and giving possession to the new members. During the pendency of the present suit, the present application was filed for production of the following original record of the Society:

“(a) Register of members

(b) Cash Books

(c) Ledger accounts for each member, depositor, creditor, miscellaneous and contingent income and expenditure and purchase and sale any good etc.

(d) Kistbandi

(e) Proceedings Book

(f) Share list of register of sharers.

(g) A Register of sureties

(h) A register showing maximum credit limit of each member

(i) A stock register

(j) A passbook for each member and depositor

(k) Register for confirmation of accounts.

(l) Register for confirmation and accounts

(m) Any other register prescribed by the registrar or required by the society for its business.”

Reply was filed to the said application and vide the impugned order dated 19.10.2023 the application was dismissed. Hence, the present revision petition.

3. Learned counsel for the plaintiff-petitioners would contend that the said documents are required for filing of the replication as the same are in possession of the defendant-respondents.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the plaintiff-petitioners.

5. In the present case, the documents sought seems to be only an endeavour to embark on a fishing and roving enquiry. The documents appear to have no relevance to the averments made in the plaint. On repeated queries by the Court, the learned counsel for the plaintiff-petitioners is unable to co-relate the prayer made in the application to the pleadings in the plaint. The relevance of the said documents has also not been explained either in the application or before this Court. In the absence of any relevance of the said

documents to the present suit, which is for a decree of permanent injunction as well as prohibitory injunction, the defendant-respondents cannot be directed to produce the said documents. In any case, even if some documents are being relied upon by the defendant-respondents in their written statement, it would be incumbent upon them to produce the same during the course of evidence. The Trial Court has noticed that there is not a word in the application that the said documents have been referred to in the written statement.

6. In view of the above, I do not find any merit in the present revision petition and the same is accordingly dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

18.02.2026
Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO