

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

CR No.877 of 2022

Date of Decision: 14.03.2022

Surjan Singh

.....Revisionist-petitioner.

Versus

Buta Singh

.....Respondent.

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Advocate
 for the revisionist-petitioner.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

The petitioner (defendant before the trial Court) herein has laid challenge to the order dated 25.11.2021 handed down by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Phul, District Bathinda whereby the application moved by the respondent (plaintiff before the trial Court) under Order VI Rule 17 read with Section 151 CPC for seeking amendment in the title of the injunction application, has been allowed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner in the present petition and have perused the file carefully.

As per the brief factual-matrix culminating in this revision petition, the respondent had filed the Civil Suit against the petitioner for seeking a decree for possession of the suit land by way of specific

performance of the agreement to sell and the application, as moved by him under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC with a prayer for granting temporary injunction, had been decided. However, in the array of the parties in the said injunction application, the names of the plaintiff and the defendant were mentioned as Baljit Singh and Sukhdev Singh respectively. The respondent preferred an application for seeking the amendment in the title of the afore-said injunction application to the extent of correcting the names of the parties which has been allowed vide the impugned order.

A perusal of the copies of the plaint Annexure P-1 and the injunction application Annexure P-2 reveals that the subject matter, i.e the suit land as described therein, is the same. Annexure P-3 is the copy of the order dated 03.10.2019 passed by the trial Court allowing the said injunction application while correctly mentioning the title therein as "*Buta Singh Versus Surjan Singh*". However, in the said injunction application, the title has been mentioned as "*Baljit Singh Versus Sukhdev Singh*" which, in view of the afore-narrated circumstances, seems to be the outcome of some typographical error.

Learned counsel for the revisionist-petitioner has not been able to put-forth any fair, candid and plausible reason as to how the impugned order qua the correction of the title in the said injunction application would adversely affect the interest/rights of the petitioner in context thereof.

As a sequel to the fore-going discussion, it follows that there

is no illegality, perversity, infirmity or irregularity in the impugned order so as to call for any interference by this Court.

Resultantly, the revision petition in hand, being *sans* any merit, stands dismissed.

March 14, 2022
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

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