



**IN THE COURT OF PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC.,
AT RANEBENNUR.**

Dated on this the 28th day of November 2025

**Present: Sri. ADITHYAKUMAR H.R, B.A.LL.B.
Prl. Civil Judge & JMFC.,Ranebennur.**

ORIGINAL SUIT NO.202/2023

Plaintiff: Beerappa Ramappa Mirji.

V/s

Defendants: Tahasildar, Ranebennur & others.

I.A. NO. 4 CAUSE TITLE.

Plaintiffs/

Applicants : Tahasildar, Ranebennur & others.

-Vs.-

Opponent/

Defendants: Beerappa Ramappa Mirji.

ORDER ON IA NO.4

When the case was posted for further chief of PW1, the AGP for defendants No.1 to 6 has filed the present application Under Order VI Rule 17 of CPC seeking amendment to the para No.17 and insert para No.18 & 19 in the written statement.



2) The application is accompanied by the affidavit of the Applicant/Defendant.

In his affidavit contended that, the plaintiff has filed the present suit for cancellation of sale deed dated 31.10.2018 and due to work pressure and inadvertently they could not plead proposed amendment at the time of filing the written statement. It is further contended that, the proposed amendment is necessary for the proper adjudication and if the application is not allowed, the very purpose of this application will be frustrated. On the basis of these contentions, the applicant prayed for allowing the application.

3) Per contra, the plaintiff has filed objection to the application contending that, the present application is neither sustainable in law nor on facts and the application not filed under proper provision of law. He has further contended that, the proposed amendment is after thought and beyond the scope of this suit and no supportive documents produced in respect of proposed amendment. It is further contended that, the issues are already framed and the case is posted for evidence. As such the proposed amendment would not sustainable in the eye of law and no cogent reason are made out in the affidavit. Hence, on these



grounds contended that, the present application is not sustainable in the eye of law and prayed for dismissal of the application.

4) Heard arguments from the Counsel for either side. Perused the materials on record.

5) The following points that would arise for consideration of this court are as hereunder;

- 1.** Whether the amendment as sought in IA No.4 is necessary for the determination of the real question in controversy.?
- 2.** Whether the applicants are due diligent in filing the present application at this stage.?
- 3.** Can proposed amendment be allowed without injustice to the other side.?
- 4.** What Order?

6) My findings on the above Points are as hereunder:

Point No.1 to 3 ; In the Affirmative.
Point No.4 ; As per the final order for the following;



REASONS

7) Point No.1 to 3:-

Since points No.1 to 3 are inter-connected; hence in order to avoid the repetition of discussion, the above said points are taken together for common discussion.

7.1) At the very outset it becomes incumbent upon this court to clarify that, the present suit is filed against the defendants for the relief of cancellation of sale deed and other consequential reliefs. It is true that, the applicant has filed this application after lapse of some times from the date of filling of his written statement and after commencement of trial. Though PW1 was examined, his cross examination is yet to be commenced and he also having the rights to give any further evidence on the proposed amendment. The plaintiff also having every opportunities to cross examine the witnesses of applicants with regard to proposed amendment if any grounds found in the proposed amendment. Further, at this stage, this court cannot hold mini trial to conclude whether the proposed amendment is true or not and the same can be ascertained by full pledged trial and no conclusion can be



drawn by the court at this stage about the contention of the plaintiff regarding limitation or relevancy to the case of plaintiff.

7.2) It would be apposite to observe here that there can be no doubt that the Courts should adopt a liberal approach in allowing such amendments of pleadings, which may be necessary for a just and effective adjudication of the dispute between the parties. This Court is also conscious that, the Courts cannot be expected to turn a blind eye and rather must stay alive to any prejudice or injustice, which could be caused to the opposite party while deciding an application for amendment of pleadings.

7.3) It would be relevant to reproduce Order 6 Rule 17 CPC, which is as follows:

“17. Amendment of pleadings-The Court may at any stage of the proceedings allow either party to alter or amend his pleadings in such manner and on such terms as may be just and all such amendments shall be made as may be necessary for the purpose of determining the real questions in controversy between the parties.

Provided that no application for amendment shall be allowed after the trial has commenced, unless the Court



comes to the conclusion that in spite of due diligence, the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of trial.”

A bare reading of proviso to Order 6 Rule 17 makes it abundantly clear that once the trial has commenced, amendment of pleadings should not be allowed unless and until the parties seeking such amendment is able to show that despite exercise of due diligence, the proposed amendment could not have been brought forth earlier or before the commencement of the trial.

7.4) Admittedly, the proposed amendment sought by the defendants does not alter the cause of action nor nature of suit. Though the amendment should be made before commencement of trial or settlement of issues, if the court satisfied that the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of the trial despite due diligence such applications needs to be allowed. It is also well settled principle that, a prayer for amendment of the plaint and a prayer for amendment of the written statement stand on different footings. Though the general principle that the amendment of pleadings cannot be allowed so as to alter materially or substitute cause of action or the



nature of the claim, it has no counter part in the principles relating to amendment of written statement.

7.5) In this context the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Basavan Jaggu Dhobi v. Sukhnandan Ramdas Chaudhary (Dead) [1995 Supp (3) SCC 179]**, held as under;

"As regards the first contention, we are afraid that the courts below have gone wrong in holding that it is not open to the defendant to amend his statement under Order 6 rule 17 CPC by taking a contrary stand than was stated originally in the written statement. This is opposed to the settled law open to a defendant to take even contrary stands or contradictory stands, the cause of action is not in any manner affected. That will apply only to a case of the plaint being amended so as to introduce a new cause of action."

Further, reiterating the same principle the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Usha Balashaheb Swamy and others Vs. Kiran Appaso Swamy and others - 2007 AIR SC 1633**, held as under;

"Since we have already held that in the case of amendment of a written statement, the defendant is entitled to take new defence and also to plead inconsistent stand and in view of our discussions made herein above that by making the application for amendment of the written statement, admission was not at all withdrawn by the appellants nor a totally inconsistent plea was taken by the appellants in their application for amendment of the written statement, the High Court had failed to appreciate that by the proposed amendment, the appellants were not withdrawing their admission in respect of the half share in the ancestral property rather they only added that the plaintiff and defendant nos. 3 to 8 could be entitled to such share if they



proved to be the legitimate children of Appasao (since deceased) who was entitled to half share in the property of late Veersangayya. That apart, it appears from the record that the written statement filed by the appellants was before the death of defendant no.1 (first wife of Appasao). After the death of defendant no.1, when plaintiff and defendant nos. 2 to 8 claimed themselves as heirs and legal representatives of defendant No.1, the appellants sought amendment of the written statement challenging the legitimacy of plaintiff and defendant nos. 2 to 8. In view of the discussions made herein above, we do not think that it was impermissible in law for the appellants to seek amendment of the written statement in the manner it was sought for.”

7.6) Thus, after going through the proposed amendment there is no any inconsistency in the defence taken by the applicant and adding the proposed amendment as new ground in the written statement would not raise any prejudice to the other side. As already discussed in the judgment of **Usha Balashaheb Swamy** (Supra) the courts are inclined to be more liberal in allowing amendment of the written statement than plaintiff. To sum up where the amendment sought in the suit in respect of any clerical errors and to add left out pleadings it must be permitted by permitting to correct the same. Further, by way of the proposed amendment, the nature of this suit will not be changed and by allowing the present application at this stage, the parties would not be subjected to any prejudice especially the plaintiff will not put to any hardship and parties would be at



liberty to set up their case and defense according to the present position in the dispute. It would also be important to note that by allowing the application, the nature of the suit would not change. Accordingly, I proceed to answer the points no.1 to 3 in the **Affirmative.**

8) Point No.4- For the reasons stated above and considering the nature and circumstances of the case in hand. I proceed to pass the following

ORDER

I.A. No.4 filed by the Applicant/defendants under Order VI Rule 17 of CPC is hereby allowed;

Consequently the applicants are permitted to carryout the amendment of written statement as sought for in the application within 14 days from the date of this order.

Call on for amended W/S. By; 12.12.2025.

Sd/-

**(Adithyakumar H.R)
Pri. Civil Judge and JMFC.,
Ranebennur.**

