

KAVN300010062018



**IN THE COURT OF THE CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC.,**  
**AT: HAGARIBOMMANAHALLI**

DATED THIS THE 20<sup>th</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY- 2026

PRESENT

**Sri. SAYED MOHIUDDIN URF KHAWAJA PEERAN, B.A., LL.B. (Spl.),**

CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC., HAGARIBOMMANAHALLI

**O.S.No.63/2024**

PLAINTIFF/s : **1. Siddalingappa S/o Sharanappa Age: 68 years**  
**2. Kotreshappa S/o Sharanappa Age: 65 years**  
**3. Rampurada Basavaraja S/o Sharanappa Age:**  
**63 years**  
**4. Shivamurthi S/o Sharanappa Age: 61 years**  
**5. Rampurada Shanmukhappa S/o Sharanappa**  
**Age: 59 years**  
**6. Rampurada Megharaj S/o Sharanappa Age:**  
**57 years**

All are R/o Bannikallu village, H.B.Halli Taluk,  
Vijayanagara District.

**7. Veeramma W/o Basavarajappa**  
**D/o Sharanappa Age: 55 years,**  
R/o Ujjini village, Kottur Taluk,  
Vijayanagara District.

**Vs.**

DEFENDANT/s : **1. Pujari Thindappa S/o Pujari Andanappa**  
Aged about: 50 years,  
**2. Pujari Ajjappa S/o Pujari Andanappa**  
Aged about: 48 years,

3. B.M Panchakshari S/o late Jeethendrappa  
Aged about: 60 years,
4. B.M.Shobhavva W/o B.M.Chidanandappa  
D/o late Maralu Siddaiah,  
Aged about: 58 years,
5. B.M.Nataraja S/o late B.M.Guruddaiah  
Aged about: 50 years,
6. B.M.Jagadeesh S/o late B.M.Guruddaiah  
Aged about: 48 years,
7. B.M.Sujatha D/o late B.M.Thippeeraiah  
Aged about: 40 years,
8. B.M.Gurunatha S/o late B.M.Thippeeraiah  
Age: 38 years

All are R/o Bannikallu village,  
H.B.Halli Taluk, Vijayanagara District.

**I.A.No.V**

APPLICANT/PLAINTIFF/s: **Siddalingappa S/o Sharanappa**  
**and others**  
(Rep. by Sri.**B.M.A.**, Advocate.)

**Vs.**

RESPONDENT/DEFENDANT/s: **Pujari Thindappa**  
**S/o Pujari Andanappa**  
**and others**  
(Rep.by Sri.**PNA/KPK**, Advocate.)

**:ORDER ON I.A.No.V FILED BY THE PLAINTIFF UNDER ORDER VI RULE 17 R/w SEC.151 of CPC:**

The plaintiffs have filed the present I.A.No.V under Order VI Rule 17 R/w Sec.151 of CPC to amend the plaint.

The proposed amendment is as under :-

**SCHEDULE**

- 1. Delete at page No.10 plaint schedule “North: Land of Pujar Ajjappa” mention here.***
- 2. Add at Page No.10 plaint schedule “ North: Land of Kudligi Basavaraja “ following to be added.***
- 3. Delete at Page No.10 plaint schedule “South:land of Kudligi Basavaraja” mention here.***
- 4. Add at Page No.10 plaint schedule “South: Land of Pujar Ajjappa” following to be added:***

**2.** In the accompanying affidavit to the IA, it is stated by the plaintiff No.1 that, the plaintiffs have filed the present suit against the defendants for the relief of declaration of title and permanent injunction with respect of the suit schedule property. Due to

typographical mistake towards the north and south boundaries of the suit schedule property are wrongly mentioned. Therefore it is just and a necessary to amend the plaint as prayed in the IA. The said amendment is necessary for determining the real question in controversy between the parties. The said amendment does not change the nature of the suit. If the application is allowed no injustice will be caused to the other side, if the application is not allowed they will be put to hardship. Hence, they prays to allow the IA.

**3.** To the said application, the defendants have filed objections by denying the contention of the plaintiffs and further contended that, dictionary meaning of typographical error is a mistake in printed matter resulting from mechanical failure of some kind. In view of that said the mistake does not fall within the per-view of mechanical failure of some kind. Further the said amendment will change the identity of the property and leads to fresh claim. The said amendment application is filed at belated stage, hence they prays to dismiss the application.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the records.
5. The following points arise for my consideration:

**1. Whether the plaintiffs have made out proper grounds to allow the I.A.No.V?**

**2. What order?**

6. My answers to the above points are as follows:

Point No.1 : In the **AFFIRMATIVE**

Point No.2 : As per the final order for the following: -

**REASONS**

**7. Point No.1 :-** The present suit is filed by the plaintiff against the defendants for the relief of declaration of title and permanent injunction with respect of the suit schedule property. In the present case on hand, defendants have appeared before the Court and filed the written statement and issues have been framed. When the case was posted for plaintiffs evidence the plaintiffs have filed the present application for amendment of plaint.

8. Order **6 Rule 17** of **Civil Procedure Code., 1908** provides as under:

***"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."***

9. I have perused the material available on record. On going through the same it appears that the said amendment will not introduce any new case. The said amendment will not withdrawn any admissions and further it appears that, the said amendment is necessary for determining the real question in controversy

between the parties. The said amendment will not set up an entirely new case. The said amendment is appear to be clarify the pleadings.

**10.** In the reported decision **(2022) SCC Online SC 1128 (Life Insurance Corporation of India vs. Sanjeev Builders Private Limited & Anr.)** in **Para No.70** of the said Judgment the **Hon'ble Supreme Court of India** held as under.

*70. Our final conclusions may be summed up thus: (i) Order V Rule 2 CPC operates as a bar against a subsequent suit if the requisite conditions for application thereof are satisfied and the field of amendment of pleadings falls far beyond its purview. The plea of amendment being barred under Order V Rule 2 CPC is, thus, misconceived and hence negated.*

*(V) All amendments are to be allowed which are necessary for determining the real question in controversy provided it does not cause injustice or prejudice to the other side. This is mandatory, as is apparent from the use of the word "shall", in the latter part of Order VI Rule 17 of the CPC.*

***(Vi) The prayer for amendment is to be allowed.***

***(i) if the amendment is required for effective and proper adjudication of the controversy between the parties, and***

***(V) to avoid multiplicity of proceedings, provided***

***(a) the amendment does not result in injustice to the other side,***

***(b) by the amendment, the parties seeking amendment does not seek to withdraw any clear admission made by the party which confers a right on the other side and***

***(c) the amendment does not raise a time barred claim, resulting in divesting of the other side of a valuable accrued right (in certain situations).***

***(iv) A prayer for amendment is generally required to be allowed unless***

***(i) by the amendment, a time barred claim is sought to be introduced, in which case the fact that the claim would be time barred becomes a relevant factor for consideration,***

***(V) the amendment changes the nature of the suit,***

***(Vi) the prayer for amendment is malafide, or***

***(iv) by the amendment, the other side loses a valid defence.***

**(v) In dealing with a prayer for amendment of pleadings, the court should avoid a hypertechnical approach, and is ordinarily required to be liberal especially where the opposite party can be compensated by costs.**

**(vi) Where the amendment would enable the court to pin-pointedly consider the dispute and would aid in rendering a more satisfactory decision, the prayer for amendment should be allowed.**

**(vV) Where the amendment merely sought to introduce an additional or a new approach without introducing a time barred cause of action, the amendment is liable to be allowed even after expiry of limitation.**

**(vVi) Amendment may be justifiably allowed where it is intended to rectify the absence of material particulars in the plaint.**

**(ix) Delay in applying for amendment alone is not a ground to disallow the prayer. Where the aspect of delay is arguable, the prayer for amendment could be allowed and the issue of limitation framed separately for decision.**

**(x) Where the amendment changes the nature of the suit or the cause of action, so as to set up an entirely new case,**

***foreign to the case set up in the plaint, the amendment must be disallowed. Where, however, the amendment sought is only with respect to the relief in the plaint, and is predicated on facts which are already pleaded in the plaint, ordinarily the amendment is required to be allowed.***

***(xi) Where the amendment is sought before commencement of trial, the court is required to be liberal in its approach. The court is required to bear in mind the fact that the opposite party would have a chance to meet the case set up in amendment. As such, where the amendment does not result in irreparable prejudice to the opposite party, or divest the opposite party of an advantage which it had secured as a result of an admission by the party seeking amendment, the amendment is required to be allowed. Equally, where the amendment is necessary for the court to effectively adjudicate on the main issues in controversy between the parties, the amendment should be allowed. (See Vijay Gupta v. Gagninder Kr. Gandhi & Ors., 2022 SCC OnLine Del 1897).***

On looking through the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the opinion that if the said amendment application is

allowed no injustice will be cause to the defendants. Mere allowing for amendment of pleadings does not means that same is proved. The burden of proving the same as per amendment is lies on the person who sought the amendment. Furthermore, the defendants have full opportunity to file the additional written statement to contest the suit. If the said application is not allowed it cause injustice to the plaintiffs and further it amounts to multiplicity of the proceedings. Furthermore, the suit is in initial stage, trial is not commenced. If the application is allowed no injustice will be caused to the defendants. If the said application is allowed on cost it would meets the ends of justice. The advocate for defendants have relied the reported decision 2025 (2) KCCR 1313 (SC) Naganna (dead) by LRs/ Smt.Devamma and others V/s Siddaramegowda (since deceased) by LRs and others. I have gone through the above said decision, the facts and circumstances of the present case on hand and the facts and circumstances of the above said decision are totally different. Therefor the said decision is not applicable to case on hand. On the basis of above reasons and discussion, I hold **Point No.1** in the **AFFIRMATIVE**.

**11. Point No.2** :- For the aforesaid reasons and discussions made above I proceed to pass the following: -

**ORDER**

I.A.No.V filed by the plaintiffs under Order VI Rule 17 R/w Sec.151 of CPC., is hereby allowed on cost of Rs.500/-.

The plaintiffs are permitted to amend the plaint as prayed in the IA.

*(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and computerized by him, corrected by me, and then pronounced in the open court on this the **20<sup>th</sup> day of February 2026.**)*

**(SAYED MOHIUDDIN URF KHAWAJA PEERAN)  
CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC., HAGARIBOMMANAHALLI**