

\$~7

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CM(M) 1233/2016 and CM Nos. 44352-55/2016

SANJANA AGGARWAL Petitioner

Through Mr.Sachin Sharma, Advocate.

versus

VIJAY LAXMI JAIN Respondent

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT NATH

ORDER

%

06.01.2017

1. By the present petition the petitioner seeks to impugn the order dated 26.05.2016 by which an application filed by the respondent/plaintiff under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC was allowed.
2. The amendment sought is very limited. There appears to be a dispute as to whether the sale deed depicts the correct address of the suit property. The plaintiff described the suit property as 4829, Arya Pura, Subzi Mandi, Delhi in the plaint. The sale deed which was executed on 17.06.1994 gives the description of the property as XII/4329. By the amendment the respondent seeks to add that the sale deed has a typographical error and this is clear from the fact that in the sale deed the adjacent properties are described as XII/4828 and 4830-31. The trial court allowed the application.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has opposed the impugned order allowing the amendment application on the ground that the evidence is at an

advance stage and that certain findings have been recorded by the trial court while disposing of the application which may prejudice the petitioner.

4. In my opinion, neither of these contentions is reflected from the impugned order. In any case, it is a simple amendment which cannot possibly cause any prejudice to the petitioner.

5. The petition is without merit and is dismissed.

6. All pending applications also stand dismissed.

JAYANT NATH, J.

JANUARY 06, 2017/rb