

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

**C.R. No.4219 of 2016
Date of Decision.11.07.2016**

Tejinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Kaushalya Devi

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Amit Bhanot, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

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?

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

The petitioner-defendant is aggrieved of the impugned order whereby the application seeking amendment of the written statement at the stage of his evidence has been dismissed.

Mr. Amit Bhanot, counsel for the petitioner submits that the previous counsel, whom the petitioner had changed subsequently, has erroneously admitted the factum of mortgage whereas there is relationship of landlord and tenant. This fact surfaced only on engagement of the new counsel and necessity arose to modify/amend the written statement and thus urges for amendment of the written statement on certain terms and conditions.

I have heard the counsel for the petitioner, appraised the paper book and of the view that if once there is admission with regard to mortgage, the defendant cannot be permitted to shun off old face and take up a new face. The petitioner-defendant cannot take the liberty of moving an

application for amendment of the written statement especially to resile from the admission which he has already made to the prejudice of the plaintiff.

In the wake of the observations made above, I do not find any illegality or perversity in the order impugned and cannot be stated to be without jurisdiction. I find no reason for interference. The civil revision is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

July 11, 2016
Pankaj*