

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

139

**CR No.1767 of 2024 (O&M)
Date of Order:19.03.2024**

Rajesh Mittal

.Petitioner

Versus

Satish Kumar

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

**Present: Mr. Shubham Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.**

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

1. The petitioner herein is a tenant. The proceedings for his ejectment are pending before the court of Rent Controller. The case is at the stage of rebuttal evidence.

2. The petitioner's application for permission to amend the written statement to assert that the landlord's family has shifted from Malerkotla to Ludhiana has been dismissed. The correctness of the aforesaid order has been challenged before this court.

3. The learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that the court has wrongly refused to grant permission to amend the written statement. He submits that subsequent events are required to be brought on record.

4. This court has considered the submissions of the learned counsel representing the petitioner.

5. As per Order VI Rule 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, the parties are required to incorporate only material facts in a concise form in their pleadings and not the evidence. Whatever the petitioner wishes to add in the pleadings is a matter of evidence.

6. Hence, no ground to interfere.
7. Dismissed.
8. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

March 19, 2024
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

:YES/NO
:YES/NO