

Civil Revision No. 8399 of 2015(O&M)
Date of Decision: 16.3.2016

Sakinder Kaur

---Petitioner

versus

Bahadur Singh and others

---Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: Mr. Atul Gaur, Advocate
for Mr. Sumeet Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner

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

Rekha Mittal, J.

The present petition has been directed against order dated 3.9.2015 passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division), SAS Nagar Mohali, whereby application filed by the petitioner under Order VI Rule 17 of the Code of Civil Procedure (for brevity “CPC”) for permission to amend the plaint, has been dismissed.

Counsel for the petitioner would submit that though the amendment sought to be made by addition of para 4(a) in the plaint is only explanatory in nature, however, the petitioner confines his prayer only qua amendment in sub para (b) of para 8 in order to correct the year as 1982 instead of 2082, result of a typographical error.

Keeping in view the nature of order proposed to be passed, no notice is required to be issued to the respondents in order to save them from

unnecessary inconvenience and expenses.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner and perused the records.

In para 8 of the plaint, there is a reference to the Will dated 20.8.1982 on the basis whereof mutation is stated to be sanctioned in favour of respondents/defendants No. 1 to 3. In sub para (b) of para 8, the year 2082 in place of 1982 appears to be the result of typographical error and accordingly the same is allowed to be corrected.

Disposed of accordingly.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

16.3.2016
PARAMJIT