

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

Civil Revision No.5087 of 2014

Date of decision: 17.03.2015

Suman Behl

... Petitioner

versus

Tarun Behl and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. J.S. Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

K.Kannan, J. (*Oral*)

1. The application for amendment, which was allowed and in terms of which, an amendment was carried out by the plaintiff, was sought to be annulled through an application filed by the defendants. The ground for such an application was that the amendment had not been made within 14 days from the date of the order in the manner required under Order 7 Rule 18 CPC.

2. The counsel for the petitioner points out that the court was granting time to carry out amendment and I have seen that if the court that allows for amendment has also allowed the plaintiff to carry it out by granting time, impliedly it must be taken that the court has allowed for extension of time. Further, I find that the parties are parents, son and daughter-in-law respectively and the amendment brought cannot be taken as constituting any prejudice.

3. The order passed is set aside and I allow the amendment carried out to be retained and dismiss the application filed by the respondents to annul the amendment carried out. The revision petition is allowed.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

17.03.2015
sanjeev