

2024:PHHC:041425

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

CR-1830-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.03.2024

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 (Oral)

1. Learned counsel representing the petitioner admits that an identical revision petition, filed by the petitioner, involving the identical issues, has been dismissed by this Court on 19.03.2024, with the following order:-

“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.”*

2. Hence, dismissed.

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

21.03.2024

rekha

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)

JUDGE