

**113**

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

**1. Civil Revision No.3646 of 2018  
Date of Decision: 26.07.2018**

**M/s Mehak Hospitality Pvt. Ltd., and others  
.....Petitioners**

**Vs**

**M/s Splendor Landbase Ltd., ...Respondents**

**2. Civil Revision No.3658 of 2018**

**S. Satpal Singh**

**.....Petitioner**

**Vs**

**M/s Splendor Landbase Ltd., ...Respondents**

**CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH***

Present:Mr. Rajinder Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

\*\*\*\*

**RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.**

[1]. Vide this common order Civil Revision Nos.3646 and 3658 of 2018 are being disposed of. Since common question of law and facts are involved in both the petitions, therefore, facts are being culled out from Civil Revision No.3646 of 2018.

[2]. Both the revision petitions have been preferred by the petitioner(s)/defendants against the order dated 17.04.2018 passed by the Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.) Amritsar vide which the application filed by the plaintiff/respondent for amendment of the

plaint was allowed.

[3]. Brief facts are that the plaintiff wanted to amend the plaint on the ground that due to inadvertent and typographical mistake in para no.6 of the plaint it was wrongly mentioned that defendant paid a sum of Rs.50,000/- to the plaintiff on 07.06.2013. The same error crept in para no.7 of the plaint as well. The mistake was typographical mistake due to over sight and the parties knew each other case. The defendants are still to lead their evidence, therefore, no prejudice shall be caused to them. The amendment in question was allowed by the trial Court subject to payment of costs of Rs.2,000/- to be paid by the plaintiff to the defendants

[4]. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submitted that in the written statement the claim of the plaintiff was denied and still he re-asserted the same in the replication.

[5]. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s).

[6]. In para no.6 of the plaint, it was pleaded by the plaintiff that lastly the defendants paid a sum of Rs.50,000/- to the plaintiff on 07.06.2013.. The said fact was denied by the defendants in their written statement, but the plaintiff reiterated the same in the replication. In the statement of account filed by

the plaintiff for the period 01.04.2010 to 31.03.2016 Ex.P17, it was specifically mentioned that the plaintiff paid an amount of Rs.50,000/- to the defendant for transfer of land.

[7]. In reply to para no.6 of the plaint, the corresponding para no.6 of the written statement is reproduced as under:

*“6. That para no.6 of the plaint is wrong and denied and the plaintiff be put to strict proof thereof. It is denied that lastly the defendants paid a sum of Rs.50,000/- to the plaintiff on 07/06/2013. In the plaint the payment of this amount by the defendants to the plaintiff where as the statement of account filed by the plaintiff shows that the payment of amount by the plaintiff to the defendants on 07/06/2013. The statement of Rs.50,000/- in the account of the defendant no.1. This reflects that the plaintiff is very much aware that his suit was hopelessly time barred but still he was misleading the court by concealment and suppression of material facts. It is denied that presently a sum of Rs.1,20,50,000/- is still due towards the defendants as alleged. It is denied that defendants are liable either to transfer the land in the name of the plaintiff or to pay this alleged amount along with the interest. This suit cannot be entertained by this court without the payment of requisite court-fee.”*

[8]. Perusal of the aforesaid para would show that defendants have admitted the statement of account filed by the plaintiff showing the payment of amount by the plaintiff to the defendant on 07.06.2013. It is settled principle of law that all

*bona fides* amendments are to be allowed.

[9]. Keeping in view the indulgence granted by the trial Court in the aforesaid context, I deem it appropriate not to interfere in the impugned order dated 17.04.2018 passed by the Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.) Amritsar. Both the revision petitions are accordingly dismissed.

July 26, 2018

*Atik*

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

Yes/No

Yes/No