

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

C.R. No.1917 of 2016

Date of Decision.15.03.2016

Ravinder Sachdeva

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Krishna Dhingra and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Nitin Kant Setia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. An amendment was sought by the plaintiff with reference to the mistake that was alleged to have been brought in the pleading. The objection which was taken by the defendant was that the plaintiff had availed as many as 16 opportunities and taken several adjournments for examining the witnesses. Only when the plaintiff was unable to examine some of the witnesses, he has now moved an application for amendment with reference to killa number of the property. If the plaintiff's contention is that there was mistake in the killa number and that is sought to be corrected, I do not find any prejudice resulting in such a situation. The contention is that the court should have at least awarded costs. I am not prepared to order costs in the civil revision when I do not even find any merit in the civil revision.

2. The order is sustained and the civil revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 15, 2016

Pankaj*