

**NIRMLA
Versus
STATE OF HP AND ORS**

CWP-4969 of 2022

29.10.2025

Present: Mr. Hirdaya Ram, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Rajan Kahol and Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General, with Mr. Ravi Chauhan and Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for State.
Mr. Prashant Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

CMP-4547 of 2024

By way of instant application filed under Order VI Rule 17 read with Section 151 CPC, prayer has been made on behalf of applicant/petitioner for amendment of the prayer clause.

Though by way of filing reply to the application, afore prayer made by the applicant/petitioner has been opposed by non-applicants/respondents, but having regard to the nature of amendment, this Court is of the view that no prejudice, if any, shall be caused to either of the parties in case amendment, as prayed for, is permitted to be carried out.

No prayer has been made by applicant/petitioner for amendment in the body of the petition, rather to bring prayer in conformity with the averments contained in the petition, prayer has been made to amend the prayer clause, which prayer made by the applicant/petitioner appears to be justified.

In view of the above, this Court sees no impediment in allowing the present application and accordingly the same is allowed. Amendment, as sought to be carried out, is permitted to be carried out. Amended petition is taken on record.

Application stands disposed of.

CWP-4969 of 2022

Learned Additional Advocate General fairly states that since amendment has only been carried out in the prayer clause, there is no requirement to file amended reply, rather reply already filed to unamended petition may be read as reply to the amended petition. Ordered accordingly.

Since pleadings are complete and parties are duly represented, let the case at hand be listed for hearing on **05.12.2025**, as prayed for.

October 29, 2025

(Rajeev Raturi)

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**