

136

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

**RA-CR-1-CII-2017 (O&M) IN
CR-85-2016**

Date of decision : 20.02.2017

Lajwanti @ Lajjo

... Applicant/Petitioner

Versus

Ashok Kumar and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Avnish Mittal, Advocate
for the applicant/petitioner.

Ms. Gurnam Kaur Turka, Advocate
for the non-applicant/respondent(s).

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

This Court vide order dated 30.11.2016 had partly allowed the
aforementioned revision petition.

However, the present review application bearing No.RA-CR-1-
CII of 2017 has been filed.

Prayer in the aforementioned application under Section 114
read with Order 47 Rule 1 CPC and Article 226 of the Constitution of India
is for review/clarification/modification of the order dated 30.11.2016.

Mr. Avnish Mittal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
applicant/petitioner submits that the amendment was on account of a
subsequent event, but not the event which was in the knowledge i.e. prior to
the amendment.

This fact was not accepted by this Court.

However, during the course of hearing of the application, Ms. Gurnam Kaur Turka, learned counsel appearing on behalf of non-applicant/respondent(s) has brought to the notice of this Court that the mutation bearing No.5152 was not a subsequent event, though, the same has been set aside by this Court vide order dated 05.04.2011 in CWP No.7690 of 2010, but the fact remains that the mutation cannot be kept in abeyance.

In case the petitioner succeeds in the suit, the natural consequences will automatically follow.

With the aforesaid observation, the present review application stands disposed of.

20.02.2017
Yogesh Sharma

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

	✓
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/ No
	✓
Whether Reportable	Yes/ No