

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

119

**CR-630-2022(O&M)
Date of Order: 24.02.2022**

VIKAS MAHAJAN

..Petitioner

Versus

MEENU SEHGAL AND ANR

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr.K.S. Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

The hearing of the case is being held through video conferencing on account of restricted functioning of the Courts.

This revision petition has been filed by the alleged tenant assailing the correctness of the order passed by the learned Rent Controller while partially permitting him to amend the written statement. The learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that although, the petitioner has already denied the ownership of the respondent (the petitioner before the learned Rent Controller), however, elaborate details have not been given. He submits that the Court should have permitted the petitioner to give elaborate details.

As per Order 6 Rule 2 CPC, the pleadings are restricted to the material facts and not evidence. It is provided that every pleading shall contain, a statement in a concise form of the material facts but not the evidence by which the stated facts are required to be proved. Since, the tenant has already asserted that the respondent Meenu Sehgal is not the owner therefore, the amendment sought for is not required.

The learned Rent Controller while declining the prayer has thoroughly examined the matter.

Hence, no ground to interfere is made out.

Dismissed.

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

February 24th, 2022

Ay

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No