

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

134**CR-4232-2026****Date of decision: 02.07.2026****M/s Pardeep Mittal and sons and another**

. . . . Petitioners

Vs.**M/s Shankar Milk Products and another**

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: - Mr.Sanjay Jain, Advocate, for the petitioners.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners herein are the petitioners-landlords in a petition filed under Section 13 of the Haryana Urban (Control of Rent and Eviction) Act 1973 seeking ejectment of the respondents from the demised premises. The petition is pending before learned Rent Controller, Ambala.

2. Petitioners are aggrieved by the order dated 07.05.2026 (Annexure P1) whereby their application seeking amendment of the petition has been disallowed.

3. It is contended by learned counsel that in the caption of the petition, name of the petitioner No.1 has been wrongly mentioned as M/s Pardeep Mittal and Sons through its Karta Shri Pardeep Mittal instead of Pardeep Kumar & Sons (HUF) through its Karta Pardeep Kumar Mittal. Similarly the name of petitioner No.2 has been wrongly mentioned as Pardeep Mittal instead of Shri Pardeep Kumar Mittal @ Pardeep Kumar. Similar inadvertent mistakes have also been made in para Nos.3 & 4 of the petition. In order to make these corrections, the application was moved, but the trial Court has declined the amendment on the ground that the application was moved at the belated stage.

4. Assailing the order, learned counsel has drawn attention towards the fact that in the similar petitions filed against other tenants, the same Presiding Officer had allowed the application of the petitioners for amendment of the petition in the similar circumstances. Learned counsel has placed on record copy of the order dated 18.03.2025 (Annexure P7) passed in RP/35/2019 and also a similar order dated 18.03.2025 (Annexure P9) passed in RP/40/2019. Learned counsel has also drawn attention towards the affidavit (Annexure P5) of Vijay Shankar Yadav-respondent No.2 herein, who is the proprietor of respondent No.1, as per which he has no objection in case the aforesaid amendment is allowed.

5. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioners and considering the no objection of respondents in view of the affidavit placed on record, the present petition is allowed. Order dated 07.05.2026 (Annexure P1) is hereby set aside. Trial Court concerned is directed to permit the petitioners to make the necessary amendment in the petition as sought by them and then proceed further in accordance with law.

6. Since in view of the affidavit of respondent No.2 (Annexure P5), as placed on record, the petition has been allowed, without issuing any notice to the respondents, the respondents will be at liberty to approach this Court, if they feel aggrieved by this order.

The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

02.07.2026

Vivek

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No