



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

125

CR-4998-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 31.07.2025

M/s Hero Cycles Ltd.

...Petitioner

V/s

Sh. Sham Lal Prop.

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Ankur Ghai, Advocate, for the petitioner.
(through video conference)

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

The instant revision petition, preferred under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, assails order dated 02.07.2025 (Annexure P-1), passed by the Court of Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Ludhiana, vide which the application moved by the petitioner-plaintiff for leading additional evidence was dismissed.

2. The facts, as emanating from the revision petition, are that a suit for recovery of Rs.4,76,318/- along with interest was instituted by the petitioner-plaintiff against the respondent-defendant.

3. The suit was opposed by way of written statement (Annexure P-3).

4. After conclusion of evidence, the defendant is stated to have produced a document in rebuttal evidence which was a communication dated 11.4.2019 stated to have been issued by the petitioner-plaintiff (Ex.D1), wherein it was mentioned that the outstanding amount was Rs.20,719/-. Under the circumstances, an application (Annexure P-5) for leading additional evidence was filed by the petitioner-plaintiff seeking to clarify that the outstanding amount was Rs.2,10,260/- as had been stated in the plaint and not Rs.20,719/- as stated in Ex.D1, which was the result of a typographical error.



5. The application was opposed by way of reply (Annexure P-6).
6. By way of the impugned order, the said application came to be dismissed leading to the filing of the instant revision petition.
7. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that application for leading additional evidence had been moved only with a view to clarify the fact that the figure in Ex.D1 was the result of a typographical error. He submits that no prejudice would be caused to the defendant if the said additional evidence is permitted to be led.
9. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner but find the same to be devoid of merit.
10. Concededly, both sides have concluded their evidence and Ex.D1 was produced by the defendant in rebuttal evidence. The trial Court rightly observed that the fact sought to be clarified by way of leading additional evidence can always be clarified during the course of arguments and this would, under no circumstance, be taken to be a ground for leading additional evidence. I do not find any error in the view taken by the trial Court warranting interference.
11. That being so, I do not find any merit in the instant revision petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

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

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

July 31, 2025

vchgarg	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	:	Yes/No