

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.8741 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: December 22, 2015

Reetam Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Meenakshi Bansal

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers 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)

The present revision is filed against the impugned order dated 09.10.2015 passed by learned Addition District Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib vide which the application for amendment of the petition filed under Section 13-B of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 was allowed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that inadvertently, it was stated in the para No.8 of the petition that she is residing with her parents along with two children for the last two years. Similarly in para No.10, it is stated that the parties are living separately for about two years. By amendment, the petitioner wanted to change the said period from 'about two years' to 'more than one year.'

The lower Court found that amendment is of clerical nature and will not change the nature of the suit and the same was allowed. The

respondent-husband is not satisfied with the said order and file the present revision. Learned counsel has argued that it is the apprehension of the husband-petitioner that after making such amendment, the wife will bring the complaint under Domestic Violence Act, within limitation.

I am of the view that if there is any apprehension of the husband, it has no basis at this stage to decline the amendment. The amendment is of clerical nature, therefore, exercising of the revision powers under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, this Court does not find any illegality and infirmity in the impugned order and finds no ground to interfere in the same.

Dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

December 22, 2015
Dinesh Bansal