

215.

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

Civil Revision No.2410 of 2013

Date of decision:01.12.2015

Mohan Lal

... Petitioner

versus

Bachna Ram alias Bachna

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Rakesh Chopra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate,
for the respondent.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ? No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ? No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. The defendant who resisted the suit for mandatory injunction for removal on the ground that he was a licensee and pleaded for a family settlement as having been made already, brought an application for amendment of the written statement that his licence was irrevocable. This has been rejected by the court below. I set aside the order and allow the same as a pure legal plea and if evidence is already closed, no evidence will be required only on the basis of this amendment. On the other hand, if the evidence

is not closed, the court will frame an additional issue as follows:-

Whether the alleged licence could be treated as
irrevocable in the manner contended by the
defendant? OPD.

2. Needless to state that if the defendant has led any
evidence on this issue, the plaintiff will also have a right of rebuttal
if he so chooses to give.

3. The impugned order is set aside and the civil revision is
allowed subject to the observations made above.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

01.12.2015
sanjeev