



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(116)

CR No.73 of 2025

Date of Decision: 10.01.2025

Subhash Chand Sharma @ Subhash Chand

...Petitioner

Vs

Santosh Kumari and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Lajpat Rai Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

1. The present petitioner assails the order dated 30.07.2024 (Annexure P-5), passed by the Court of Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Meham, District Rohtak, vide which the application (Annexure P-4) preferred by the petitioner/defendant for summoning of 15 witnesses was disposed of and permission was granted only to summon witnesses at Sr. No. 1 and 2, whereas permission *qua* rest of the witnesses i.e. at Sr. No. 3 to 15 in the application was declined.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that primarily, the application filed by the petitioner for summoning of 15 witnesses has been rejected on the ground that it has been filed belatedly and also that no useful purpose would be served by summoning witnesses at Sr. No. 3 to 15 as the purpose of calling them has not been specified in the application.

3. Upon a specific query put by the Court, learned counsel for the petitioner concedes that no purpose has been specified in the application for summoning witnesses at Sr. No 3 to 15. He submits that the said witnesses were to be summoned as they have also raised some construction in the

vicinity. Again, upon being pointed out, learned counsel concedes that no such stand has been taken in the written statement. However, learned counsel submits that for the time being, he would not impugn the present order, but if at a later stage, after examination of witnesses at Sr. No. 1 and 2, some other witnesses including the witnesses at Sr. No. 3 to 15 are required to be examined, the petitioner may be permitted to file another application giving the reasons and the purpose of examination of such witnesses.

4. Keeping in view the statement given by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present revision petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to learned counsel to move the requisite application at the relevant stage. If such an application is moved, the same shall be decided by the Court concerned as per law and of-course without being influenced by the dismissal of the application by way of the present impugned order.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

January 10, 2025

Rekha

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