



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

WRIT PETITION NO. 6961 OF 2025

Sudhir Tejpratap Singh, Aged 37 years, Occ: Business
R/o Flat no.302, Deshmukh Complex, Adjacent to Jeet
Bar, Suraksha Nagar, Datta Wadi, Nagpur.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Dinesh Ramjivan Singh, Aged 47 years, Occ:
Business, R/o Plot no.40/D/2, Near Basketball
Ground, Tilak Nagar, Nagpur-10.
2. Raju Dhanraj Chauhan, Aged 44 years, Occ:
Agriculturist, R/o 23/27, Mahadeo Nagar,
Lavha, Taluka and District Nagpur.

RESPONDENTS

Shri S.M. Bhangde, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri S.S. Dewani, counsel for the respondent no.1.

CORAM : PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.

DATE : APRIL 18, 2026

ORAL JUDGMENT

RULE. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally with consent of the learned counsel for the parties.

2. By this petition, the petitioner has assailed the order dated 08.09.2025 passed by the Appellate Court allowing the application filed by the respondent no.1 for correction of address mentioned in the cause title of the memorandum of appeal.

3. The petitioner is the original respondent no.1 in Regular Civil Appeal no.122 of 2022 which is filed by challenging the judgment and decree in Regular Civil Suit no.179 of 2018.

4. During pendency of the appeal, the appellant filed an application at Exhibit 56 for correction of the cause title of the memorandum of appeal to only correct the address of the appellant which came to be allowed subject to costs of Rs.1,000/- by order dated 08.09.2025. The petitioner has challenged this order by way of instant petition.

5. The petitioner's primary contention is, the respondent i.e. the appellant in Regular Civil Appeal no.122 of 2022 has failed to mention his correct address in the cause title and the attempt to get the address corrected is to remove the discrepancy about incorrect address which is vital in the proceedings since the issue about service of notice upon the said appellant is involved. He submitted that the correction is sought for without demonstrating any due diligence and the application for correction is filed to prolong the proceedings.

6. The learned counsel for the respondent no.1 has vehemently opposed the petition and justified the impugned order by submitting that the correction in address in cause title does not amount to changing the nature of litigation and cannot result in causing any prejudice to the other side.

7. It has to be noted that by the application at Exhibit 56, the appellant in the regular civil appeal has only sought for correction of the cause title to mention the address as 'resident of plot no.4-D/2, near

Basketball Ground, Tilak Nagar, Nagpur-440010', which was incorrectly mentioned earlier as 'plot no.40/D/2, near Basketball Ground, Tilak Nagar, Nagpur-440010' in the cause title. After considering the contentions in this regard, the trial Court has observed that the correction by way of proposed amendment is technical in nature and the incorrect address was inadvertently typed. It is also observed that the correction of address does not amount to withdrawing any admissions and rather the correction of the address is required to avoid further confusion and multiplicity of proceedings. By considering the position of law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Varun Pahwa Versus Renu Chaudhary*** [(2019) 15 SCC 628], the trial Court has allowed the application subject to costs. Even the counsel for the respondent no.1 while supporting the impugned order pointed out that correction of address in the cause title does not cause any prejudice to the other side and he placed reliance on the said judgment in ***Varun Pahwa*** (supra).

8. After giving due consideration to the contentions of the parties, it appears that the correction of address in the cause title is necessary for avoiding any confusion. The trial Court has allowed the application for correction of cause title by observing that the correction/amendment is necessary to serve the ends of justice. As such, the trial Court has positively exercised the discretion to allow the application which does not appear to be perverse warranting interference under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Hence, the writ petition is dismissed with no order as to costs. Rule stands discharged.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)

APTE