

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.2854 of 2015

Date of Decision.05.05.2015

Jeet Singh @ Surjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Malkiat Singh and another

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Swaran Tiwana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers 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?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The application for amendment in the written statement was filed after the defendant engaged another counsel and he sought to bring elaborate contentions through the amended written statement. I have seen the original written statement and the amendment sought to be brought and I find there is nothing substantial brought through the subsequent written statement. If there was something substantial, the Court could have allowed the amendment and if it has chosen not to do so, it was doing it on the basis of the amended provisions of the Civil Procedure Code that will disable a person from bringing amendment after commencement of the trial unless the fact brought through the amendment was such as that could not be brought out in spite of exercise of due diligence. If the Court below has declined to entertain such an application, I will find no need for modifying the same. I find that no prejudice was caused to the defendant by denial of amendment

and there is no justification for an intervention by exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

May 05, 2015
Pankaj*