

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-4488 of 2018(O&M)
Date of decision: 22.08.2022

Manuj Mittal

..Petitioner

Versus

Raj Rani and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Parteek Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Anupam Gupta, Sr. Advocate, with
Mr. Bhavnik Mehta, Advocate
for the respondents.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

An application filed by the plaintiff to amend the plaint in order to seek further relief of possession has been allowed by the trial Court during the pendency of the suit.

Defendant no.1 assails its correctness by filing the revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

This Bench has heard the learned counsels representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the paper book.

The learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that the plaintiff failed to prove due diligence, therefore, amendment could not be allowed.

It may be noted here that the plaintiff has already filed a suit claiming that he is the sole owner as late Sh. Parmod Kumar Mittal executed a Will in her favour. While culling out the issues, the Court has already framed a distinct issue with respect to the possession of the property. The

amendment sought is only formal in nature.

Hence, no ground to interfere is made out.

Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

August 22, 2022

nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>