



CR No. 5336 of 2025 (O&M) -1-

126 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARHCR No. 5336 of 2025 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 11.08.2025

ASHOK KUMAR

.....PETITIONER

Vs.

MRS. BINDU RANI

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr.Gursharan Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL, J.

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 16.07.2025 (Annexure P-4), passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Mukerian, in Case bearing No. CS-75-2021, titled *Bindu Rani vs. Ashok Kumar*, whereby the application filed by the petitioner for directing PW Ravish Kumar to produce the title deeds of 8-10 shops situated at Hajipur has been dismissed.

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

3. The present respondent, Mrs. Bindu Rani, had filed a suit for possession of the shop and the stairs in question before the learned lower Court against Ashok Kumar, son of Kartar Singh (present revisionist/petitioner). In the said suit, the present revisionist/petitioner filed an application stating that he required the title deeds of the shops of PW Ravish Kumar, as the said witness had admitted in his cross-



examination that he would produce the same. It was further submitted that the title deeds were necessary to impeach the credibility of the said witness.

4. The said application was opposed by the respondent-plaintiff, and the learned trial Court, vide order dated 16.07.2025, which is under challenge, observed that no ground was made out for directing PW Ravish Kumar to produce the title deeds of 8–10 shops at Hajipur. It was further observed that the cross-examination of PW Ravish Kumar already stood concluded, and therefore, the application was dismissed.

5. In view of the order proposed to be passed, notice is not being issued to the respondent as it would delay the proceedings besides entailing additional expense to the respondent-plaintiff.

6. Learned counsel for the revisionist/petitioner submitted that the title deeds of 8–10 shops were required to be produced before the learned lower Court to assess the credibility of PW Ravish Kumar. However, this Court is of the view that the respondent-plaintiff has simply filed a suit for possession of the shop and stairs in question, and the title deeds of 8–10 shops forming part of the remaining property were not required to be produced. The learned trial Court has rightly concluded that no ground was made out for directing PW Ravish Kumar to produce the title deeds of 8–10 shops situated at Hajipur.

7. Thus, this Court finds no merit in the prayer for setting aside the order dated 16.07.2025 (Annexure P-4), passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Mukerian.

8. Finding no illegality in the order dated 16.07.2025 (Annexure P-4), the present revision petition, being devoid of merit, is accordingly



dismissed.

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

AUGUST 11, 2025
nitin

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking	Yes
Whether Reportable	No