



124

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

**CR-3884-2025 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision : 26.09.2025**

Surajmal

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Vijay Singh &amp; Anr

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN**

Present : Mr. Ram Darshan Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

**ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)**

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India challenging the order dated 12.05.2025 vide which the application filed by the plaintiff-petitioner under Order 6 Rule 17 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC) for amendment of the plaint has been dismissed.
2. Brief facts relevant to the present *lis* are that the plaintiff-petitioner herein filed a suit for possession by way of specific performance of the agreement to sell dated 24.12.2012. During the pendency of the suit, an application was filed by the plaintiff-petitioner under Order 6 Rule 17 of CPC for amendment of the plaint. Reply was filed to the said application and vide the impugned order dated 12.05.2025 the application has been dismissed. Hence, the present revision petition.
3. Learned counsel for the plaintiff-petitioner would contend that certain khasra numbers were left out due to a typographical mistake and hence

by way of the amendment, the plaintiff-petitioner only wants to add the khasra numbers.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the plaintiff-petitioner.

5. In the present case the amendment sought is for introducing certain khasra numbers which are alleged to have been left out in the plaint. However, the amendment sought is for introducing certain new properties which are not even the part of the original agreement to sell dated 24.12.2012. The Trial Court has observed that the trial had also proceeded substantially and that the amendment if allowed would introduce new properties which would then result in delaying the proceedings. Infact, by introducing certain new properties which are not even part of the original agreement to sell dated 24.12.2012, the very nature of the suit would be changed as the suit is for specific performance of the agreement to sell dated 24.12.2012.

6. In view of the above, no fault can be found with the impugned order dated 12.05.2025. I do not find any merit in the present revision petition. The same being devoid of any merit is accordingly dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

26.09.2025  
Yogesh Sharma

**( ALKA SARIN )**  
**JUDGE**

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking  
Whether reportable: YES/NO