



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

CR-6853-2025

Date of decision:25.09.2025

PARAMJEET ...Petitioner
versus
SUNITA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Ms. Parnika, Advocate for
Mr. Amit Khatkar, Advocate
for petitioner.

PARMOD GOYAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner is respondent No.1 before the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Rothak, whereby the evidence of respondent No.1 was ordered to be closed. Learned Counsel for petitioner has argued that order of closure of evidence passed by learned Tribunal is harsh and disproportionate punishment. Learned Counsel for petitioner further argued that delay in proceeding is attributable to other side; the evidence of petitioner is necessary for fair adjudication; that no prejudice would be caused to the contesting respondents and that procedure should not override ends of justice as procedure is handmaid of justice and prays that in the interest of justice, petitioner be granted one last opportunity to lead evidence.

2. Admittedly, the impugned order dated 14.08.2025 (Annexure P/4) was passed after granting six clear opportunities to the petitioner-respondent. Petitioner was duly put to caution on last two dates when last opportunity was granted to him, however, petitioner on account of his

own default had failed to conclude his evidence.

3. However, since the consequences of decision against petitioner, who is stated to be driver of offending vehicle are serious, therefore, in the interest of justice, it would be appropriate to grant one effective opportunity to the petitioner subject to cost to compensate the other side for delay being caused by acts of petitioner-driver. Accordingly, petitioner is allowed one opportunity to conclude his evidence subject to cost of Rs.20,000/-.

4. Now the matter is fixed for 23.10.2025. In the meanwhile, petitioner shall take dasti notices of all his witnesses and get them served through process of Court, if necessary. If any witness is required to be examined through process of Court then petitioner shall be duty bound to place report of service before the Court. Court on consideration of service report on the date fixed may grant further opportunity. However, in case service is not effected or no report is placed on record through the process of Court due to fault on the part of petitioner, no further opportunity shall be granted to petitioner. The entire evidence of petitioner shall be concluded on the date fixed. No further opportunity shall be granted subject to above terms.

5. Present Civil Revision is disposed of accordingly.

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

25.09.2025
Sunil Chander