

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

**Civil Revision No.4842 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: August 14, 2015**

Gurpreet Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

Ram Gopal and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Amit Kumar Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

- 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)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 03.07.2015 (Annexure P-6) passed by learned Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Samrala, vide which the application of the petitioner for permission to lead additional evidence was partly dismissed with regard to producing himself as witness regarding mutation No.3545 after the amendment of the plaint.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner had sought the amendment of the plaint, which was allowed on 05.03.2015, vide which he was allowed to correct the mutation number from 3403 to 3545. Later on, application was filed for additional evidence to examine the plaintiff to state about the said mutation.

The said permission was declined though the petitioner was allowed to place on record the jamabandi of the year 1981-82.

I am of the view that the fresh statement regarding correct number of mutation is not required at all. Mutation does not confer any title. There is no need of additional evidence.

Hence, the permission to lead additional evidence to the plaintiff (petitioner herein) was rightly declined by the lower court.

The present revision petition is dismissed accordingly.

However, the petitioner is at liberty to press this point during the course of arguments before the lower court.

August 14, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE