



CR-2503-2026 (O&M)

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

121

**CR-2503-2026 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 18.03.2026**

**DERA BABA RAM DAYAL AND ANOTHER**

**...PETITIONERS**

**VERSUS**

**COMMITTEE DERA BABA TEHAL DASS AND OTHERS**

**...RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present : Mr.Sunny K. Singla, Advocate for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*\*

**YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (ORAL)**

1. This revision petition has been instituted by the petitioners/plaintiffs under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the impugned order dated 03.02.2026 (Annexure P-6) passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Moga vide which the evidence of the petitioners has been ordered to be closed and permission to tender the jamabandis and one judgment dated 28.11.2003 in documentary evidence has been declined.

2. In view of the nature of the order proposed to be passed, issuance of notice to the respondents is dispensed with, as it would only delay the proceedings and cause unnecessary expenditure to the respondents.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the material placed on record.

**CR-2503-2026 (O&M)**

4. Perusal of the record shows that the petitioners had earlier filed Civil Revision No.9462 of 2025, which was disposed of vide order dated 22.12.2025 by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and the petitioners were granted two opportunities to lead their evidence. A further perusal of the impugned order reveals that on 03.02.2026, it was the second opportunity for the petitioners to lead evidence in compliance with the order dated 22.12.2025 passed by this Court. On the said date, PW Shinderpal Singh was examined and plaintiffs/petitioners sought to tender jamabandis for the year 2007-08, 2012-13, 2017-18 and 2022-23 as well as a judgment dated 28.11.2003, while closing their evidence. However, the Trial Court observed that one PW Balraj Dass, who intended to tender the said documents has already been examined earlier and had not tendered these documents during his examination while leading his evidence and did not allow petitioners to tender the documents..

5. However, the approach of the learned Trial Court is highly erroneous. PW Balraj Dass is one of the plaintiffs and even if, he had already been examined as his own witness, either he or his counsel could have tender the jamabandis and the certified copy of the judgment dated 28.11.2003 while closing their evidence. The said documents were otherwise per se admissible in evidence. The plaintiffs thus could not have been denied the opportunity to tender these documents while closing their evidence in the affirmative.

6. Resultantly, I am of the considered opinion that the impugned order dated 03.02.2026, suffers from material illegality and



**CR-2503-2026 (O&M)**

manifest error and the same is not sustainable in the eyes of law. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 03.02.2026 is hereby set aside and the Trial Court is directed to permit the petitioners to tender the aforesaid jamabandis and the judgment in evidence.

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

**18.03.2026**

Vishal Vardhan

**(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No