

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR 2907-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.03.2018

Dharam Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

Shekhar and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Mukesh Rao, Advocate for the petitioner
None for the respondents

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 25.3.2014 (Annexure P-4) passed by Civil Judge (Junior Division), Kosli, vide which, application moved by the plaintiff-petitioner under Order VI Rule 17 CPC 1908 was dismissed.

Heard.

A perusal of the application shows that the plaintiff has stated that some documents were earlier not available and now, plaintiff wants to produce said documents relating to the disputed property for which amendment of the plaint is necessary. Documents are mentioned in the application. It is stated that though the plaintiff took a plea of the bona fide co-sharer and having specific possession over the specific area with specific revenue numbers but in view of the documents, specific plea and description thereof were not incorporated by the counsel.

I am of the view that it is not mentioned in the application as to which specific plea was not taken and which description was not given which is sought to be mentioned. Application is vague one. Merely, on the basis of vague application, no amendment can be allowed even though the amended plaint specifying amendment has been annexed with the application.

Consequently, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

07.03.2018

gk

(Kuldip Singh)
Judge

Whether speaking/ reasoned:	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No