



126 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-8093-2025

Date of decision : 09.04.2026

HARDEEP SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

PREETJOT KAUR

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Ivan Singh Khosa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Namit Gautam, Advocate
for the respondent.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

The present revision petition is directed against the order dated 17.10.2025 passed by Civil Judge, Junior Division, Ludhiana.

2. The present revision petition has arisen out of the suit filed by the plaintiff seeking decree of possession of a residential property. The suit was initially filed with the property being described as, “house measuring 120 Sq. Yards bearing No.7775/8, New Janta Nagar, Gill No.2, ATI Road, Ludhiana”. Along with the plaint, site plan was attached as Annexure P/3 which also described the site plan *qua* property bearing No.7775/8.

3. The plaintiff moved an application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC seeking amendment of the plaint claiming that inadvertently and owing



to typographical mistake, description of the property was wrongly given as property bearing No.7775/8 instead of M.C. No.7775/8/1.

4. The application was allowed.

5. The defendant approached this Court by way of CR No.4986 of 2016 which was decided vide order dated 18.10.2024. The defendant in the said revision petition specifically raised an objection w.r.t. evidence led by the plaintiff including the site plan and claimed that the entire evidence has been led *qua* property No.7775/8 and thus when the suit is at the penultimate stage, plaintiff cannot be allowed to amend the pleadings.

6. Plaintiff specifically claimed while seeking amendment that he would not lead any evidence in support of the proposed amendment.

7. This Court dealt with the objection raised by the defendant observing as under:

“16. In the considered opinion of this Court, once the defendant’s case is that the evidence has been led w.r.t. property bearing No.7775/8 with which the plaintiff has no concern and by way of present amendment, the property number has been changed from 7775/8 to 7775/8/1, no prejudice will be caused to the defendant. Obviously, the fact that the evidence led by the plaintiff is beyond pleadings would be an arrow in the armour of the defendant.”

8. Thereafter, the present application has been filed whereby the plaintiff now wants to improve upon the site plan, Exhibit P-3, claiming correction of a typographical error in the same.



9. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the Trial Court has wrongly non-suited the plaintiff holding that the application was required to be filed under Order VI Rule 17 CPC whereas in terms of the ratio of law laid down by Supreme Court in the case of **Pratibha Singh vs. Shanti Devi Prasad, (2003) 2 SCC 330**, it is only by resorting to Section 151 CPC that the site plan, which is primarily required to identify the property during the pendency of the suit, can be corrected.

10. Counsel for the defendant has referred to the cross-examination of the plaintiff, who appeared as PW-1 wherein he claimed that the plaintiff has not placed any site plan in the suit and site plan, Exhibit P-3 does not bear his signatures.

11. There is no quarrel with the proposition that the plaintiff can claim correction in the site plan by moving an appropriate application under Section 151 CPC. The Court has inherent powers to make such orders as are necessary for the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of process of Court. The one who seeks exercise of jurisdiction by the Court to meet the ends of justice, must come clean before the Court.

12. In the present case, the plaintiff earlier sought amendment in the plaint making categorical statement that he shall not lead any evidence in support of the proposed amendment. In his cross examination, while appearing in the witness-box, plaintiff totally disowned the site plan, Exhibit P-3.



13. In these circumstances, this Court finds that the conduct of the petitioner does not merit any interference by the Court much less under Section 151 CPC.

14. Resultantly, finding no merit in the present revision petition, the same is ordered to be dismissed.

April 09, 2026			(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr			Judge
	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	:	Yes/No