

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

**CR No.8468 of 2015 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: December 11, 2015**

**Narotam Sharma**

**.... Petitioner**

**vs.**

**Union of India and another**

**.... Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

**Present:** Mr. Parminder Singh, 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 27.10.2015 (Annexure P-5), vide which an application of the present petitioner under Order VI, Rul 17 for amendment in the claim application pending before the Railway Claims Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh, was dismissed.

By way of the amendment in the claim application, the petitioner wants to plead that the deceased boarded the train from Hisar to Bhiwani, whereas earlier, it was claimed that he had boarded train No.59722P from Mandi Adampur to Bhiwani.

The claim application is at the stage of arguments.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the train No.59722P is in fact a train, which runs between Hisar and Bhiwani. Therefore, it was wrongly mentioned that the deceased boarded the train from Adampur to Bhiwani.

I am of the view that since train number is given, therefore, it is always open to the petitioner to prove the route of said train. Therefore, if one or the other station is mentioned, it will not affect the disposal of the application on merits.

It being so, the present revision petition is dismissed with the observation that the amendment sought for is unnecessary and that the petitioner can always prove that the deceased boarded train No.59722P and its route.

**December 11, 2015**  
sarita

**(KULDIP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**