

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

1. Civil Revision No. 3395 of 2018 (O&M)

Krishan Lal

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Davinder Singh alias Minda

... Respondent(s)

AND

2. Civil Revision No. 2652 of 2019 (O&M)

Krishan Lal

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Davinder Singh alias Minda

... Respondent(s)

DATE OF DECISION: 19.05.2022

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Harkaran Singh, Advocate,
Legal Aid Counsel for the petitioner (In CR-3395-2018).

Mr. Sunil Kumar Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner (In CR-2652-2019).

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. By this order, two revision petitions i.e. Civil Revision No. 3395 of 2018 and Civil Revision No. 2652 of 2019 shall stand disposed of.

The learned counsel for the petitioners are *ad idem* that both the revision petitions can be disposed of together.

2. The dispute is between the tenant and his landlord. The petitioner is tenant. He has filed a suit for mandatory injunction for issuance

of directions to remove his lock put on the door of the shop and return his

articles and also restrain the defendant from taking forcible possession of the shop. The suit was filed in the year 2014. When the trial of the suit was nearing completion, he filed as many as three applications for permission to amend the plaint. The petitioner wants to re-assert the facts already pleaded and also wants to incorporate certain developments which took place during the pendency of the suit. The Court has dismissed the applications.

3. As per Order VI Rule 2 CPC, the pleadings are required to contain the material facts only. There is no requirement to incorporate the evidence sought to be led. As already noticed, it is the plaintiff's suit for grant of mandatory injunction in order to remove the locks which has been allegedly put by the landlord. Hence, the necessary facts have already been asserted. Furthermore, the subsequent developments can be taken a note of, if any, brought before the Court without formally amending the pleadings.

4. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, no ground to interfere is made out. Hence, both the revision petitions are dismissed.

5. The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, in both the revision petitions, shall stand disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

May 19, 2022
"DK"

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No