

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

CR No.6536 of 2015

Date of decision: October 05, 2015

Gurdeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Jaswinder Singh

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Arihant Jain, 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 is the order dated 28.08.2015 (Annexure P-3) passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Patiala vide which application for the amendment of plaint was allowed so as to mention the boundaries of the disputed property in the plaint.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the amendment was allowed after the evidence of the plaintiff had started.

The plaintiff had already availed 16 opportunities to conclude the evidence.

The contention in this regard was raised in the reply but not mentioned in the impugned order. Therefore, it is stated that the impugned order is a non-speaking order.

After considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the amendment has been allowed subject to costs of ₹1,000/- to be paid to the defendant. By way of amendment, only boundaries of the disputed property are sought to be mentioned in the plaint.

The Lower Court has observed that this will be beneficial for the adjudication of the case and it will also avoid multiplicity of the proceedings. It being so, even though the amendment was allowed after the commencement of trial, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order as no new plea is being raised. Hence, the present revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

October 05, 2015

jt