

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

CR No.4764 of 2016 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 28.07.2016

Sunil Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Rajinder Kaur and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.**

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment ?
2. To be referred to reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr. A.P. Kaushal, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)**

The petitioner-tenant is aggrieved of the impugned order, whereby application under Order 6 Rule 17 of CPC seeking amendment of paragraph Nos.1 to 4 of the reply, has been dismissed.

Mr. A.P. Kaushal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that as per the rent note, there is condition that petitioner No.2 namely Bhupinder Singh was landlord. However, due to inadvertence in the written statement, wife Rajinder Kaur petitioner No.1 has been admitted as landlord. Suit is at the stage of cross-examination of the landlord witnesses. The trial Court has declined the application erroneously and perversely, much less, on the ground that it tantamounts to the

withdrawal of the admission.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book and of the view that actually it tantamounts to withdrawal of the admission. Rent petition is of the year 2013. It is nothing but only delaying tactics as the petitioner under the garb of the amendment is seeking recalling of landlord witnesses, rightly so, Courts below have not interfered in view of the aforementioned fact.

No explanation has come forth in withdrawing the admission. Even otherwise both the husband and wife have filed rent petition, therefore, amendment is of no inconsequence.

Dismissed.

**28.07.2016**

*pawan*

**(AMIT RAWAL)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable:- Yes/No