

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

**CR No.1361 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : February 27, 2018**

Ramesh Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Tilak Raj and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper 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 ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Heard.

Vide impugned order dated 29.01.2018 (Annexure P-1), the learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Patti, dismissed the application filed by the plaintiff-petitioner for amendment of plaint, which was moved when part of the arguments were already advanced after the conclusion of the evidence.

It comes out that by way of amendment, the plaintiff-petitioner wants to state that the house in dispute which is bearing khasra No.2579, situated at Patti Town.

The trial Court observed that in this case, the arguments have been partly advanced. In the original agreement of sale, khasra number is not mentioned. I am of the view that the property is situated within Patti Town. The house is to be described by the boundaries, therefore, the amendment is at much belated stage and is also unnecessary. The facts sought to be mentioned by way of amendment were within the knowledge of the plaintiff-petitioner. Therefore, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order.

As such, the present revision petition is dismissed.

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**

February 27, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes Whether Reportable: No