

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

CR No. 403 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: February 2, 2016

Sudarshan Puri

...Petitioner

Versus

Pritam Singh and others

...Respondents

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?**

Present: Mr. Ravi Kamal Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwaljit Singh, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Ajaivir Singh, Advocate,
for respondents No. 4 (a) and 4 (b).

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. An application for amendment consequential to impleadment under Order 22 Rule 10 of the Code of Civil Procedure was brought belatedly after two years. The defendant claims to be aggrieved. The amendment order makes merely a reference to the purchase by the person who has been permitted to be impleaded as assignee. There is a reference of the purchaser as having obtained all the rights of the plaintiffs No. 1 to 4, including the right to claim mesne profits.

2. The cause of action includes reference to purchase that has taken place subsequently. There can be no prejudice, for, such amendment which is merely consequential.

3. The order already passed is sustained and the revision is dismissed.

February 2, 2016

prem

**(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE**