

**CR No. 1411 of 2015**

**Date of Decision: November 30, 2015**

**Smt. Dharmo Devi**

**.... Petitioner**

**vs.**

**Radhey Shyam Sharma & others**

**.... Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

**Present:** Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Advocate for  
Mr. Amit Jain, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate  
for respondent No.1.

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

**Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)**

Summons of respondent Nos. 2 & 3 received back with the report that they have left the given address. Memo of parties shows that they are proforma respondents and no relief is claimed against them. Therefore, their service is dispensed with.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the order, it comes out that the plaint was amended on 04.02.2014 and defendants No. 2 to 10 were impleaded as party-defendants. Some pleas were raised against them. Defendant Nos. 2

to 4 and 8 also filed written statement to the amended plaint. Additional issues were framed. In such circumstances plaintiff has the right to file additional evidence in support of the amended pleadings. It is against the order of allowing the plaintiff to file additional affidavit that the present petitioner has come in the revision.

I am of the view that once the new parties were added and additional issues were framed, the plaintiff was rightly held to be entitled to file additional affidavit in support of the amended pleadings and against the newly added defendants. No ground is made out to interfere in the impugned order.

Hence, the revision is dismissed.

**November 30, 2015**  
rimpal

**(KULDIP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**