

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

C.R. No.3734 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision.28.05.2015

Wazir Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Sardara Singh

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Vikas Bahl, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Namit Gautam, Advocate and
Mr. Arjun Kundra, 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 person who has gone through the entire gamut of evidence for trial for last 16 years has come with an amendment in respect of khasra numbers at the time after arguments and before delivery of judgment saying that he has committed mistake in referring to the numbers wrongly. The senior counsel for the petitioner would make reference to the copy of the jamabandi to show that the mistake had arisen on account of similarities of the mistaken number given in the plaint to the number which is actually given in the petition. The senior counsel would contend that the objection taken by the respondent is that the correction which is sought to be made is not really the property which belonged to him which according to the petitioner is not a correct pleading.

2. By an amendment in a suit for specific performance in

relation to some property which is not claimed by the defendant to belong to him, the plaintiff will only cause a further delay in the disposal of the case.

3. Periodical instructions are given by this Court to all the subordinate courts to ensure that there is no suit which is pending beyond a period of five years. The suit between five to ten years are brought in “action plan cases” and cases which are pending for more than 10 years are monitored on a regular month to month basis by the High Court. There are also expressions from the Supreme Court Judges at various times from public platforms as well as through judgments that the Indian Judiciary is striving hard to make efforts that the old cases are immediately disposed of, more particularly cases more than five years old. I cannot halt the proceedings where trial in a case is over and the case is posted for judgment. If the order is passed against him, he may bring the dismissal of the order which is now impugned before this Court, as a ground of appeal in the manner contemplated under Section 105 of the Civil Procedure Code.

4. I decline to make any intervention. The revision petition is dismissed with the above observations.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

May 28, 2015
Pankaj*