

Manoj Kumar and Another Vs Sh. Jagan Nath and Others

Court: High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Date of Decision: Oct. 1, 2012

Hon'ble Judges: Rajan Gupta, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: T.P.S. Tung, for the Appellant;

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Rajan Gupta, J.

Present revision petition has been preferred to impugn order dated 24.9.2012, passed by the court below whereby

application filed by the plaintiffs for leading additional evidence has been rejected. Learned Counsel for petitioners has argued that plaintiffs ought

to have been allowed to lead additional evidence as same is necessary for arriving at a just decision in the matter.

2. I have heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and given careful thought to the facts of the case. It appears that suit was instituted in the year

2002 and has been pending since then. It is now fixed for rebuttal evidence/arguments. Plaintiffs claim that they are owners in possession of House

No. 3278, Sector 46-C, Chandigarh on the basis of family-settlement. In support of their stand they have already led their evidence. At this stage

application to place on record additional documents was moved. Same has been rejected by the court being irrelevant and inadmissible. I do not

find any legal infirmity to the order passed by the court below. Revision petition is without any merit and is hereby dismissed.