

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

Sr. No.111

**Civil Revision No.933 of 2021
DATE OF DECISION: April 20, 2021**

PRITAM LAL BALI ALIAS PITAMBER LAL BALI AND OTHERS

..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

REAVA PATI AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Suvir Sidhu, Advocate, for the petitioners.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners are aggrieved by order 23.02.2021 passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Ambala, whereby an application under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC for amending para 10 of the plaint has been rejected. In para 10 of the plaint, a claim for mesne profits has been raised which has been quantified as ₹4500/- to ₹5000/- per month. By virtue of the amendment, the same is sought to be amended to read as ₹45,000/- to ₹50,000/- per month as the earlier figure came on record by virtue of a typographical error.

A perusal of the impugned order shows that an application for amendment of the said para 10 was filed earlier also wherein it was stated

Civil Revision No.933 of 2021

that instead of ₹4500/- to ₹5000/- per month, the expression '*lacs of rupees*' be mentioned. The said application came to be dismissed. Thereafter, the present application has been moved and the same has been rejected on the ground that the reason that the figure mentioned in para 10 is on account of a typographical error is incorrect as had that been the case, the same reason would have been given in the earlier application also.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to point out any illegality or perversity in the reasoning of the trial Court and thus, the revision petition has no merit. The same is accordingly dismissed.

Nothing stated herein above shall be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

April 20, 2021

Ankur

**(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No