

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA
CRP No.58 of 2024**

Smt. Anindita Ray Choudhury,
W/O- Late Anjan Chowdhury,
D/O- Late Soroj Kumar Roy,
A resident of Parbati Villa,
Palace Compound, Jagannath Bari Road,
P.O- Agartala, P.S- West Agartala,
District- West Tripura, Age- 55 years
Pin- 799001

---- Plaintiff petitioner

Versus

Smt. Alakananda Roy(Basu),
W/O- Shri Biswajit Basu,
D/O- Late Soroj Kumar Roy,
A resident of Parbati Villa,
Palace Compound, Jagannath Bari Road,
P.O- Agartala, P.S- West Agartala,
District- West Tripura.
Pin- 799001

----Respondent.

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. S. M. Chakraborty, Sr. Adv, Mrs. P. Chakraborty, Adv.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. S. Saha, Adv, Mr. S. Datta, Adv.
Date of hearing	:	08.08.2024
Date of delivery of Judgment & Order	:	16.08.2024
Whether fit for reporting	:	YES

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BISWAJIT PALIT

Judgment & Order

This petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is filed for exercising the power of Superintendence against the order dated 02.07.2024 delivered by Learned Civil Judge(Senior Division) Court No.1, West Tripura, Agartala in connection with case No.T.S.(P) No.37 of 2020.

2. Heard Learned Senior Counsel Mr. S. M. Chakraborty assisted by Learned Counsel Mrs. P. Chakraborty for the petitioner and also heard Learned Counsel Mr. S. Saha and Learned Counsel Mr. S. Datta for the respondent.

3. At the time of hearing, Learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that initially the petitioner filed a suit for partition of the parental property before the Court of Learned Civil Judge(Senior Division), Court No.1, West Tripura, Agartala which was numbered as T.S.(P) No.37 of 2020 and after that in the said suit, the respondent contested the same by filing written statement stating that their father executed a Will during his lifetime with respect to the suit property. So, the suit was not maintainable. The Learned Trial Court by order dated 21.02.2022 dismissed the suit without any trial on the ground of existence of a Will.

4. Being aggrieved and dissatisfied with the order of the Learned Trial Court, the petitioner filed appeal in the Court of Learned District Judge, West Tripura, Agartala which was transferred to Ld. Additional District Judge, Court No.5, West Tripura, Agartala and the said appeal was registered as T.A. No.8 of 2022 and the Learned 1st Appellate Court thereafter on hearing both the sides by judgment dated 06.08.2022 dismissed the appeal upholding the order of the Learned Trial Court.

After that, the present petitioner challenging the judgment of the Learned 1st Appellate Court preferred second

appeal before the High Court which was numbered as RSA No.42 of 2022 and this High Court after hearing both the sides by judgment and order dated 13.03.2024 allowed the appeal and remanded back the suit to frame proper issues and to deliver a fresh judgment in accordance with law after taking evidence fixing 4(four) months time.

5. Thereafter, on 04.05.2024 the present petitioner filed an application under Order 6 rule 17 of CPC for amendment of plaint for determining the real matters of controversy between the parties before the Learned Trial Court. But according to Learned Senior Counsel, the Learned Trial Court without appreciating the contents of amendment petition rejected the said amendment petition only on the ground that in the judgment, no liberty was granted to the parties to amend their pleadings. So, challenging that order, the present petitioner has preferred this petition under Article 227 of Constitution of India for passing appropriate directions.

Learned Senior Counsel further submitted that although there was specific time bound direction from the High Court to dispose of the suit within time but this High Court did not restrict the power of the Learned Trial Court to allow amendment of pleadings and legally there was no such scope to pass any order directing the parties to take step for amendment of their pleadings. So, Learned Senior counsel urged for allowing this petition dismissing the order of the Learned Trial

Court and to pass necessary direction to dispose of the suit in accordance with law.

6. It was further submitted by Learned Senior Counsel that sometimes in absence of proper guidelines and direction of the superior authority, the Learned Trial Courts are facing confusion to pass any appropriate order for which appropriate direction is required to be given in this regard. It was also submitted that sometimes it is also found that in case of time bound direction, the lower Courts hesitates to pass appropriate order without seeking further extension of time which invites multiplicity of suits/proceedings causing prejudice to the litigants. So in summing up, Learned Senior Counsel at the time of hearing of argument drawn the attention of the Court to pass appropriate direction in this regard.

7. On the other hand, Learned Counsel for the respondent in course of hearing of argument fairly submitted that he shall have no objection if the prayer for amendment is allowed but submitted that further direction may be given to the Learned Trial Court below to dispose of the suit within a stipulated period for the sake of justice.

8. This present petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for issuing necessary directions. For the sake of convenience, I would like to reproduce hereinbelow the relevant provision of Article 227 of the Constitution of India:

227. Power of superintendence over all courts by the High Court.-

(1) Every High Court shall have superintendence over all courts and tribunals

throughout the territories in relation to which it exercises jurisdiction.

(2) Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing provisions, the High Court may –

(a) call for returns from such courts;

(b) make and issue general rules and prescribe forms for regulating the practice and proceedings of such courts; and

(c) prescribe forms in which books, entries and accounts shall be kept by the officers of any such courts.

(3) The High Court may also settle tables of fees to be allowed to the sheriff and all clerks and officers of such courts and to attorneys, advocates and pleaders practicing therein:

Provided that any rules made, forms prescribed or tables settled under clause (2) or clause (3) shall not be inconsistent with the provision of any law for the time being in force, and shall require the previous approval of the Governor.

(4) Nothing in this article shall be deemed to confer on a High Court powers of superintendence over any court or tribunal constituted by or under any law relating to the Armed Forces.

9. Now let us discuss about the relevant provision regarding amendment of pleadings as provided in Order VI Rule 17 of CPC which is reproduced hereinbelow:

17. Amendment of pleadings.- The Court may at any stage of the proceedings allow either party to alter or amend his pleadings in such manner and on such terms as may be just, and all such amendments shall be made as may be necessary for the purpose of determining the real question in controversy between the parties:

Provided that no application for amendment shall be allowed after the trial has commenced, unless the Courts comes to the conclusion that in spite of due diligence, the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of trial.

Further it is apposite to refer herein below the relevant portion of the order passed by this Court in the connected RSA No.42 of 2022 by judgment and order dated 13.03.2024:

"11. In the result, the appeal filed by the appellant-plaintiff is hereby allowed with

costs against the respondent-defendant. The judgment and decree dated 06.08.2022 delivered by the Learned First Appellate court in Title Appeal No.08 of 2022 is hereby set aside. The suit be remanded back to the Learned Trial court i.e. the Learned Civil Judge (Senior Division), Court No.1, West Tripura, Agartala for framing the proper issues and to deliver the judgment and decree in accordance with law after taking evidence and hearing arguments of both the sides within a period of 4(four) months from the date of receipt of the copy of the judgment. The parties shall appear before the Learned Trial court on 26.03.2024."

It is the admitted position that at the time of remanding back of the suit, this Court directed the Learned Trial Court to frame proper issues and to deliver judgment and decree in accordance with law after taking evidence and hearing arguments of both the sides within a period of 4(four) months from the date of receipt of the copy of judgment. So, it is clear that at the time of passing this judgment, specific direction was given to the Learned Trial Court below to dispose of the suit within a period of 4(four) months.

10. For convenience, the operative portion of the order dated 02.07.2024 passed by the Learned Trial Court in connection with case No.TS(P) No.37 of 2020 which is reproduced as under:

"Heard Ld. Counsel of both sides on the petition filed by the plaintiff under Order VI, Rule 17, CPC.

Moving the petition Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff submitted that the plaintiff had filed this partition suit which was dismissed on 21.01.2022. Thereafter, against this order of dismissal the plaintiff had filed Title Appeal bearing No.08 of 2022 before the Ld. District Judge, West Tripura, Agartala which was also dismissed affirming the order of the trial Court. Thereafter, the plaintiff preferred First Appeal before the Hon'ble High Court of Tripura which was registered as RSA 42 of 2022 and vide judgment dated 13.03.2024 the Hon'ble High Court set aside the judgment

of the First Appellate Court and the suit was remanded back to this Court with a direction for framing proper issues and to deliver judgment and decree in accordance with law. She further submitted that before framing of issues the plaintiff intends to amend the plaint by incorporating certain facts which was necessary for proper adjudication of the suit but inadvertently omitted by the plaintiff. So, the Ld. Counsel has prayed for allowing the instant petition.

Ld. Counsel Mr. S. Bhattacharjee appearing for the defendants submitted that the Hon'ble High Court of Tripura had directed this Court to frame issues and to deliver judgment and decree and in no way the Hon'ble High Court accorded any liberty to the parties to amend the pleadings. So, the instant petition filed by the plaintiff is liable to be rejected.

Considered the submission of both sides.

As the suit has been remanded back by the Hon'ble High Court of Tripura, this court is bound by the directions given by the Hon'ble High Court of Tripura. It is on record that vide judgment dated 13.03.2024 in RSA 42 of 2022, the Hon'ble High Court has remanded back this suit.

Paragraph 11 of the said judgment clearly defines what is to be done after remand of the suit and from the paragraph 11 of the judgment and dated 13.03.2024 in RSA 42 of 2022, it is evident that while remanding the suit, the Hon'ble High Court had given direction to frame proper issues and to deliver judgment and decree in accordance with law only and the Hon'ble High Court of Tripura has not granted liberty to the parties to amend their pleadings.

Considering the above direction of the Hon'ble High Court of Tripura, the instant petition filed by the plaintiff for amendment of the plaint is hereby rejected."

From the aforesaid order of the Learned Trial Court, it appears that the Learned Trial Court rejected the application for amendment of plaint on the ground that at the time of remanding back of the suit by this Court, no specific direction was given for amendment of pleadings and this Court only directed the Learned Trial Court to frame proper issues and to deliver a fresh judgment after taking evidence. So, the

Learned Trial Court by the impugned order rejected the application for amendment of plaint.

Now if we go through the relevant provision of Order VI Rule 17 of CPC it appears that the Court may at any stage of the proceeding allow either party to alter or amend his pleadings in such manner and on such terms as may be just and all such amendment shall be made as may be necessary for the purpose of determining the real question in controversy between the parties.

From the aforesaid provision of Order VI Rule 17 of CPC it appears that amendment of pleadings can only be allowed by the Court for determining the real matters in controversy between the parties.

Here, in the given case from the prayer of the petitioner, it appears that the proposed amendment was necessary for determining the real matters in controversy between the rival parties and this proposed amendment would not affect the nature and character of the suit. So, in absence of any specific direction of the Court the Learned Trial Court below could not consider the application for amendment of plaint filed by the petitioner-plaintiff. Even Learned Trial Court failed to construe the exact legal position regarding amendment of plaint.

11. At the time of hearing of argument Learned Counsel for the petitioner relied upon few citations. In **Nichhalbhai Vallabhai and others v. Jaswantlal Zinabhai**

and others dated 23.08.1965 reported in **AIR 1966 SC 997** wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court in para No.4 regarding amendment of plaint observed as under:

"4. We shall then proceed to consider the next question whether the High Court was right in allowing the application of the plaintiff for amending the plaint by deleting the words "अने छे (and have)" in "अमे छीअ (i.e. paragraph 2 and the words 'and are')" in paragraph 3 of the plaint. It was contended by Mr. Purshotam Trikumdas on behalf of the appellants that by allowing the amendment the High Court had permitted the plaintiff to convert the suit into another of a different and inconsistent character. It was submitted by Counsel that if the suit was one for severance of joint family status the plaintiff was bound to fail in limine in view of the decision of the Bombay High Court in (1892) ILR 16 Bom 29 (FB). It was contended that the plaintiff cannot be allowed to escape this consequence by amending a suit as one for partition by metes and bounds. We do not think that there is any warrant for this argument. We consider that the High Court was right in taking the view that the words "अने छे (and have)" and the words "अमे छीअ (i.e. 'and are')" were put in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the plaint by mistake and inadvertence and it was, therefore, a proper case in which the court should exercise its discretion under O. 6, R. 17, Civil Procedure Code by allowing the amendment to be made. It was contended by Mr. Purshotam Trikumdas that the plaintiff was introducing a new case by making the amendment. We do not accept this argument as correct. We have already given reasons for holding that even apart from the amendment the plaint should be properly construed as asking for relief for partition by metes and bounds and not for severance of joint family status. We are of opinion that the words "अने छे (and have)" "अमे छीअ in paragraph 2 and the words (i.e. 'and are')" in paragraph 3 of the plaint have been inserted on account of some mistake or misapprehension on the part of the plaintiff and it was, therefore a proper case in which the Court allowed the plaint to be amended. The reason is that if the amendment is refused the plaintiff may have to bring another suit and the object of the rule for allowing amendments to the plaint is to avoid multiplicity of suits. The present case falls within the principle laid down by this Court in L. J. Leach and Co. Ltd. v. Jardine Skinner and Co., 1957 SCR 438: ((S) AIR 1957 SC 357). In that case the appellants had filed a suit for damages for conversion against the respondents on the allegations that the respondents were the agents of the

appellants, that the appellants had placed orders for certain goods with the respondents, and that the respondents had actually imported the goods but refused to deliver them to the appellants. The suit was dismissed on the findings that the parties stood in the relationship of seller and purchaser, and not agent and principal and that the title in the goods could only pass to the appellants when the respondents appropriated them to the appellants' contracts. In appeal before the Supreme Court, the appellants applied for amendment of the plaint by raising, in the alternative, a claim for damages for breach of contract for non-delivery of the goods. The application was allowed by this Court on the ground that it was a fit case in which the amendment should be allowed and the fact that a fresh suit on the amended claim was barred by limitation is only a factor to be taken into consideration in the exercise of the discretion as to whether the amendment should be ordered or not, and does not affect the power of the court to order it, if that is required in the interests of justice. The case of the plaintiff for amendment in the present case stands on a stronger footing because there is no question of limitation involved and we are of the opinion that the High Court was right in permitting the amendment to be made and remanding the suit to the trial Court for a fresh hearing in accordance with law."

Referring the same, learned Senior Counsel drawn the attention of the Court that from the aforesaid citation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it would be clear that what was the exact position of law prior to the CPC Amendment Act. So, learned Senior Counsel urged for taking note of the said citation in delivering the judgment and order of this Court.

Further in **Baldev Singh and Others v. Manohar Singh and another** dated 03.08.2006 reported in **(2006) 6 SCC 498**, Hon'ble the Apex Court in para Nos.9 and 14 observed as under:

"9. Keeping this principle in mind, let us now consider the provisions relating to amendment of pleadings. Order 6 Rule 17 of the Code of Civil Procedure deals with amendment of pleadings which provides that the Court may at any stage of the proceedings allow either party to alter or amend his

pleadings in such manner and on such terms as may be just, and all such amendments shall be made as may be necessary for the purpose of determining the real questions in controversy between the parties. From a bare perusal of this provision, it is pellucid that Order 6 Rule 17 of the Code of Civil Procedure consists of two parts. The first part is that the Court may at any stage of the proceedings allow either party to amend his pleadings and the second part is that such amendment shall be made for the purpose of determining the real controversies raised between the parties. Therefore, in view of the provisions made under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC it cannot be doubted that wide power and unfettered discretion has been conferred on the Court to allow amendment of the pleadings to a party in such manner and on such terms as it appears to the Court just and proper. While dealing with the prayer for amendment, it would also be necessary to keep in mind that the Court shall allow amendment of pleadings if it finds that delay in disposal of Suit can be avoided and that the suit can be disposed of expeditiously. By the Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Act, 2002 a proviso has been added to Order 6 Rule 17 which restricts the Courts from permitting an amendment to be allowed in the pleadings of either of the parties, if at the time of filing an application for amendment, the trial has already commenced. However, the court may allow amendment if it is satisfied that in spite of due diligence, the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of trial. So far as proviso to Order 6 Rule 17 of the Code of Civil Procedure is concerned, we shall deal with it later.

14. As noted herein earlier, the case set up by the plaintiff-Respondent 1 was that his parents had no money to purchase the suit property and it was the plaintiff-Respondent 1 who paid the consideration money. In the written statement, this fact was denied and further it was asserted in the written statement that the suit property was in fact purchased by their parents and they had sufficient income of their own. In the application for amendment of written statement it was stated that the plaintiff-Respondent 1 did not have any income to pay the consideration money of the suit property and in fact the parents of the plaintiff-Respondent 1 had sufficient income to pay the sale price. It was only pointed out in the application for amendment that after the death of their parents, the suit property was mutated in the joint names of the plaintiff-Respondent 1 and the defendants in equal shares. Therefore, the question whether certain admissions made in the written statement were sought to be withdrawn is concerned, we find, as noted hereinearlier, there was no admission in the written statement from which it could be said that by

filing an application for amendment of the written statement, the appellants had sought to withdraw such admission. It is true that in the original written statement, a statement has been made that it is the Defendant-Appellant 1 who is the owner and is in continuous possession of the suit property, but in our view, the powers of the court are wide enough to permit amendment of the written statement by incorporating an alternative plea of ownership in the application for amendment of the written statement. That apart, in our view, the facts stated in the application for amendment were in fact an elaboration of the defence case. Accordingly, we are of the view that the High Court as well as the trial court had erred in rejecting the application for amendment of the written statement on the ground that in the event such amendment was allowed, it would take away some admissions made by the defendants-appellants in their written statement. That apart, in *Estralla Rubber v. Dass Estate (P) Ltd.:(2001) 8 SCC 97*, this Court held that even if there were some admissions in the evidence as well as in the written statement, it was still open to the parties to explain the same by way of filing an application for amendment of the written statement. That apart, mere delay of three years in filing the application for amendment of the written statement could not be a ground for rejection of the same when no serious prejudice is shown to have been caused to the plaintiff-Respondent 1 so as to take away any accrued right."

In **Ragu Thilak D. John v. S. Rayappan and others** dated 23.01.2001 reported in **(2001) 2 SCC 472**, Hon'ble the Apex Court in para Nos.4 and 5 also observed as under:

"4. In view of the subsequent developments, the appellant filed an application under Order 6 Rule 17 for the amendment of the plaint for adding paras 8(a) to 8(f) in his plaint. The trial court rejected his prayer and the revision petition filed against that order was dismissed by the High Court vide order impugned in this appeal, mainly on the ground that the amendment, if allowed, would result in introducing a new case and cause of action. It was further held that as the appellant was seeking recovery of damages, the amendment could not be allowed as it would allegedly change the nature of the suit. It was also observed that the amendment sought was barred by limitation.

5. After referring to the judgments in *Charan Das v. Amir Khan:AIR 1921 PC 50, L.J. Leach*

& Co. Ltd. & Anr. v. Jardine Skinner & Co.:1957 SCR 438], **Ganga Bai v. Vijay Kumar:**(1974) 2 SCC 393, **Ganesh Trading Co. v. Moji Ram :**(1978 2 SCC 91 and various other authorities, this Court in **B.K. Narayana Pillai v. Parameswaran Pillai :JT** (1999) 10 SC 61 held:(SCC p. 715, para 3)

"3. The purpose and object of Order 6 Rule 17 CPC is to allow either party to alter or amend his pleadings in such manner and on such terms as may be just. The power to allow the amendment is wide and can be exercised at any stage of the proceedings in the interests of justice on the basis of guidelines laid down by various High Courts and this Court. It is true that the amendment cannot be claimed as a matter of right and under all circumstances. But it is equally true that the courts while deciding such prayers should not adopt a hypertechnical approach. Liberal approach should be the general rule particularly in cases where the other side can be compensated with the costs. Technicalities of law should not be permitted to hamper the courts in the administration of justice between the parties. Amendments are allowed in the pleadings to avoid uncalled-for multiplicity of litigation.""

In **Mahila Ramkali Devi and others v. Nandram(Dead) through legal representatives and others** dated 14.05.2015 reported in **(2015) 13 SCC 132**, Hon'ble the Apex Court in para No.23 further observed as under:

"23. In Ishwardas vs. State of M.P., AIR 1979 SC 551, this Court observed :(SCC p.166, paras 4-5)

"4. We are unable to see any substance in any of the submissions. The learned counsel appeared to argue on the assumption that a new plea could not be permitted at the appellate stage unless all the material necessary to decide the plea was already before the Court. There is no legal basis for this assumption.

5. There is no impediment or bar against an appellate Court permitting amendment of the pleadings so as to enable a party to raise a new plea. All that is necessary is that the appellate court should observe the well-known principles subject to which amendments of pleadings are usually granted. Naturally, one of the

circumstances which will be taken into consideration before an amendment is granted is the delay in making the application seeking such amendment and, if made at the appellate stage, the reason why it was not sought in the trial court. If the necessary material on which the plea arising from the amendment may be decided is already there, the amendment may be more readily granted than otherwise. But, there is no prohibition against an appellate court permitting an amendment at the appellate stage merely because the necessary material is not already before the court.""

Referring the aforesaid citations, Learned Senior Counsel further drawn the attention of this Court that the proposed amendment would not change the nature and character of the suit filed by the petitioner-plaintiff and further the scope to allow amendment is also very wide and can be exercised at any stage of the proceedings in the interest of justice.

12. I have gone through the aforesaid citations referred by the Learned Counsel for the petitioner and it appears that the scope of amendment is very wide and it can be allowed at any stage even during the stage of appeal for determining the real matters in controversy between the rival parties.

Here in the case at hand, on perusal of the order of the learned Trial Court below, it appears that since there was specific direction from the side of the Court to the Learned Trial Court to frame issues and to deliver a fresh judgment after taking evidence. So, the Learned Trial Court was under a misconception of fact that there was no scope on the part of

Learned Trial Court to consider amendment of the plaint filed by the petitioner due to specific direction of Court. It is the settled position of law that the Court has got no authority to direct a party to take step for amendment of their pleadings. It is the discretion/choice of the party concerned what steps they would take or not on their pleadings. The Court can only direct the learned Trial Court regarding removal of any procedural defects which the Learned Trial Court fails to do so in passing any order. Even in case of specific direction, the concerned Court should dispose of the application, if any, in accordance with law without being confused by any order for proper adjudication of the suit.

13. Here in the given case since there was no such objection from the side of the contesting respondent challenging the application for amendment of plaint and there is no materials on record that the proposed amendment would change the nature and character of the suit. So, it is the considered view of this Court that Learned Trial Court below committed error in passing the order dated 02.07.2024 by rejecting the application for amendment of plaint filed by the petitioner-plaintiff.

14. Since the statute itself is very much clear that the application for amendment of pleadings may be filed by either of the parties at any stage of proceeding. So, it is the liberty of the parties of any suit to take step for amendment of pleadings if they requires to do so for determination of the real matters in

controversy. There is no scope on the part of any Court to issue any direction to either of the parties of the suit to take any step for amendment of the pleadings. Rather it is the party who is to decide the matters for determining the real matters in controversy for proper adjudication of the suit.

15. So, after hearing argument of both the sides and also after going through the order dated 02.07.2024 passed by learned Trial Court below it appears that the order dated 02.07.2024 passed by learned Trial Court below in TS(P) No.37 of 2020 needs to be interfered with.

Accordingly, in exercise of the power conferred under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, this Court is setting aside the order dated 02.07.2024 passed by learned Trial Court below in connection with TS(P) No.37 of 2020 pending before the Court of Learned Civil Judge(Sr. Div.), Court No.1, West Tripura, Agartala. The application for amendment of plaint filed by the plaintiff under Order VI Rule 17 is hereby allowed accordingly which shall form part of the plaint.

The petitioner-plaintiff be asked to submit a fresh amended copy of plaint to the learned Trial Court below henceforth furnishing copy to the other side. Necessary correction of amendment be made accordingly by the Learned Trial Court.

The respondent as defendant shall be at liberty to file additional written statement, if he or she so desires on amendment of plaint before the Learned Trial Court.

The Learned Trial Court below shall dispose of the suit in accordance with law within a period of 4(four) months from the date of receipt of the copy of this judgment/order after allowing the respondent to file additional written statement and also after framing of proper issues and taking evidence, if any, as ordered earlier in the connected RSA No.42 of 2022. If for any reason, the learned Trial Court below fails to dispose of the suit within the time frame as mentioned by this judgment in that case, the concerned Court shall be at liberty to seek for further extension of time before the appropriate authority of the High Court in due course of time. The parties shall appear before the Learned Trial Court on 27.08.2024.

A copy of this judgment be circulated by the Reg(Judl.) of this High Court to all the learned District Judges of the Districts for circulation of the same to the Learned Judicial Officers of the District for information and compliance in case of need. Also a copy of this judgment and order be furnished to Director, Tripura Judicial Academy for information.

Send down the LCRs along with a copy of this judgment and order.

Pending applications, if any, also stands disposed of.

JUDGE