

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

C.R. No.3803 of 2016

Date of Decision.30.05.2016

Shashi Kiran Mahajan

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Arun Kumar and another

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Parveen K. Kataria, 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. The revision petition is by the defendant-landlord who is aggrieved that the plaintiff-tenant had brought about an amendment to the plaint which was not originally conceived of. A suit for injunction is now ordered to be converted for several reliefs viz; relief of mandatory injunction, for demolition of construction, for restoration of staircase and other reliefs. So long as none of the reliefs could be termed to be inconsistent with the relief already asked nor could any prejudice be said to be caused to the landlord on grounds of limitation, I will find no cause for intervention with order allowing the amendment. The defendant is at liberty to file an amended written statement or additional written statement in the manner contemplated under Order 8 Rule 9 CPC and bring about all the pleas regarding the plaintiff's alleged untenable claims. The Court will examine the same at the time of trial and dispose of the case in accordance with law.

2. The order already passed is maintained and the revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

May 30, 2016
Pankaj*