

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

CR No.6797 of 2015

Date of Decision: October 13, 2015

Puran Chand

.... Petitioner

vs.

Nikhil Kumar and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. V.D. Sharma, 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 17.09.2015 (Annexure P-8) passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Jagadhri, vide which the application of the petitioner under Order VI, Rule 17 CPC for amendment of the written statement was dismissed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the case file.

It comes out that previously the present petitioner-defendant No.3 filed the written statement admitting the case of the plaintiff. Now, he wants to withdraw the said admission on the ground that the counsel for the plaintiff has appointed his junior counsel as the counsel for the applicant and that the written statement admitting the case of the plaintiff was prepared on already signed blank

papers. These allegations are very serious. The present petitioner has not sought any action against the counsel for preparing the written statement on blank singed papers.

It being so, it would mean that said plea has been taken jsut to seek amendment in the written statement, which was rightly declined by the lower court. Therefore, the petitioner cannot be allowed to withdraw the admission made in the written statement.

Hence, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

October 13, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE