

106

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

CR No.4398 of 2015

Date of decision: July 15, 2015

Jai Parkash and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

Satyanarain and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SABINA, J

Petitioners have filed this petition challenging the order dated 22.04.2015.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the trial Court has erred in permitting the plaintiff to amend the plaint as by doing so, plaintiff has changed the nature of the suit.

Plaintiff has filed suit for declaration that he was owner-in-possession of the land in question. During the pendency of the suit, an application was moved by the plaintiff for permission to amend the plaint on the ground that due to typographical error, Khatoni No.449 and Khewat No.202 had been written instead of Khewat No.349 and Khatoni No.262 in head note and Para Nos.2 and 16 of the plaint, Killa No.9/2 had been written instead of Killa No.9/1.

Further, in Para No.16 of the plaint as well as in the head

note of the plaint, the date of the sale deed was mentioned as 27.08.1987 instead of 27.08.1997. In Para No.5 of the plaint, name of the father of the plaintiffs had been mentioned as Raghvir Singh instead of Umrav Singh. Further, due to inadvertence, Khewat No.261 and Khataoi No.346 had not been mentioned in the head note of the plaint. The learned trial Court rightly held that the amendment in the plaint was sought due to typographical error. Hence, the amendment sought by the plaintiff was liable to be allowed as it would not change the nature of the suit, as by way of amendment, plaintiff merely wanted to give the correct description of the suit property.

No ground for interference by this Court, is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

July 15, 2015

m.singh