

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH****129****CR-2884-2025****Date of Decision: 13.05.2025****SATINDER SINGH****.....PETITIONER****Vs.****BANK OF INDIA AND OTHERS****.....RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA**Present: Mr. Ashish Nagar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

Petitioner herein is one of the defendants in Civil Suit bearing No.CS No.62-2024 titled as Bank of India Vs. Rurh Singh and others, pending in the Court of learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Ludhiana. He is aggrieved by the order dated 09.04.2025, whereby application under Order XI Rule 14 CPC has been disposed of without supplying the original documents.

2. The impugned order dated 09.04.2025 read as under:

The perusal of file shows that on 03.10.2024, learned counsel for the defendant had moved an application under Order 11 Rule 14 for production of documents on behalf of the defendants. Reply to said application not filed. Today, Ld. Counsel for defendant No.1(b) appeared and suffered a statement that he has received photocopies of documents produced by plaintiff except legal notice and its postal receipts and the plaintiff also failed to produce original documents of above copies. So far as remaining original document is concerned, plaintiff is directed to supply the same as and when required by the opposite party during evidence and failing which, he shall be debarred from producing the same without leave of the Court. Accordingly, the present application for production of documents stands disposed off.

Now to come up on 06.05.2025 for filing written statement on behalf of the defendant.

3. Learned counsel contends that the applicant-petitioner had asked for the original documents to be produced by the plaintiff-respondent,



but only the photocopies of the documents were produced and, therefore, the application has wrongly been disposed of.

4. This Court does not find any illegality in the impugned order considering the fact that counsel for the petitioner had made specific statement to have received the photocopies of the documents produced by the plaintiff except the legal notice and postal receipt. The trial Court had directed the plaintiff to supply the other documents as and when required by the opposite party during the evidence.

5. The case is presently fixed for filing of written statement and it appears that the present petition has been filed only with the motive to delay the proceedings.

Dismissed.

13.05.2025

Pry

(DEEPAK GUPTA)

JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned?</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>No</i>