



S. No

2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU**

SWP No. 2248/2018
CM No. 3407/2022

Reserved on : 22.11.2022
Pronounced on: 31.01.2023

Ashok Singh, Age 55 years,
S/o Sant Singh, R/o Village Birpur Tehsil,
Vijaypur, District Samba.

....Petitioner/Appellant(s)

Through :- Mr. Jagpaul Singh, Advocate

V/s

1. State of J&K through Commissioner-cum-Secretary to the Government, Higher/Technical Education and Youth Services & Sports, Civil Secretariat Srinagar;

....Respondent(s)

2. J & K State Sports Council through its Secretary Bakshi Stadium, Srinagar/Sports House MA Stadium Jammu;

3. Secretary, J & K Sports Council Bakshi Stadium Srinagar/Sports House MA Stadium Jammu;

4. Dr. Naseem Javaid Choudhary, Secretary J & K Sports Counsel MA Stadium Jammu;

5. Nuzhat Ara presently posted as Divisional Sports Officer, Bakshi Stadium Jammu.

Through :- Ms. Anshuja Tak, Advocate for R-1 to 4
Mr. Sheikh Najeeb, Advocate for R-5

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAN LAL

ORDER
31.01.2023

CM No. 3407/2022

1. By this order, I would dispose of an application seeking amendment of main writ petition being SWP No. 2248/2018. The original writ petition has been preferred by the petitioner against the respondents under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of appropriate writ, order or direction of the following nature:-

“(a). Certiorari

(i) for the quashment of minutes of the departmental promotion committee of the J&K state sports council held on 22.04.2013 to the extent it pertains to the seniority and promotion of the respondent no. 5, as the recommendations are made by the DPC in an illegal, arbitrary and mala fide manner only with intent to confer undue benefit upon the respondent no.5;



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

- (ii) for the quashment of the order dated 29.12.2014 issued by the respondent no.3 to the extent it provides for the promotion of the respondent no.5 to the post of manager;
- (iii) for the quashment of the seniority list as it stood on 27-06-2016 issued by the official respondents;
- (iv) for the quashment of the Sports Council Order no. 893 of 2017 dated 15-12-2017 passed by the respondent no.3 vide which the respondent no.5 was promoted to the post of Sports Officer by ignoring the superior claim of the petitioner;
- (v) for the quashment of the revised seniority list as it stood on 31-01-2018;

(b) Mandamus

- (i) commanding the respondents to promote the petitioner to the post of Manager w.e.f. from the date petitioner was placed as In-charge Manager Udhampur Stadium in his own pay and grade i.e.23-02-2001;
- (ii) commanding the official respondents to release charge allowance in favour of the petitioner for the period petitioner was placed as In charge Manager Udhampur Stadium in his own pay and grade i.e.23-02-2001;
- (iii) commanding the official respondents to promote the petitioner to the post of sports officer from the date respondent no.5 was promoted to the post of sports officer over and above that of the respondent no.5.

2. In the amended petition, petitioner has sought amendment on the grounds, that the core issue involved in the main petition is with respect of the seniority and promotion of respondent No. 5 to the post of Manager, wherein, petitioner has called in question the minutes of meeting of the Departmental Promotion Committee of J&K State Sports Council held on 22.04.2013 which read as under:

"The committee examined the seniority of Grade-II selection Grade coaches and observed that Mrs. Nuzhst Ara although ahead of Mrs. Nusrst Gazala in inter-se-seniority as Jr. Couch was superseded by Mrs. Nusrut Gazala on 03-08-1996 as selection Grade Coach due to adverse APR's of Mrs Nuzhut Ara. Her APRs were subsequently expunged by the competent authority and she was promoted as Selection Grade coach retrospectively vide notification issued under endorsement no. SC/967/6004-05 dt: 15-01-07 and her seniority fixed at S. No.1."

It is contended that, in the recommendations of the DPC, it is observed that adverse APRs of the private respondent were later on expunged by the competent authority and she was promoted as Selection Grade Coach retrospectively vide notification issued under endorsement No. SC/967/6004-05 dated 15.01.2007 but it was fact that adverse APRs of private respondent were never expunged by the competent authority, that at the time of preferring of the main petition, petitioner was not in possession of the aforesaid endorsement No. SC/967/6004-05 dated 15.01.2007 and



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

Sports Council Order No. 460 of 2013 dated 06.09.2013 and he tried his level best to get the copy of the aforesaid endorsements, but he could not get the same, and it was only when Respondents 2 and 3 filed their objections to the main petition, the copies of endorsements dated 15.01.2007 and Sports Council's Order dated 06.09.2013 were annexed with the objections and the said endorsements were issued vide Sports Council Order No. 22 of 2007 dated 15.01.2007. It is moreso contended, that Sports Council Order dated 15.01.2007 alongwith the Sports Council Order No. 460 of 2013 dated 06.09.2013 are required to be challenged before this Court for disposal of the main petition, whereby, amendment application requires to be allowed by this Court to the said extent, and in the interest and to meet the ends of justice, application for amendment requires to be allowed.

3. Respondents 2 and 3 have opposed the amendment application by pleading in their objections that petitioner has primarily challenged the promotion of the respondent No. 5 to the post of Sports Officer by misleading facts that petitioner is senior to respondent No. 5 as such has better claim for promotion, whereas respondent No. 5 and Nusrat Gazala were appointed as Junior Coaches in the discipline of Hockey and Kho Kho respectively vide Order No. 414 of 1988 dated 24.06.1988 against substantive posts, petitioner was working as weightlifting coach purely on consolidated basis from 01.02.1989 appointed vide Order No. 87 of 1989 dated 31.01.1989 against substantive post after respondent No. 5, as such, petitioner for all times to come is junior to respondent No. 5 on the basis of date of initial substantive appointment. It is contended, that petitioner is agitating his claim after a delay of 17 years, therefore, on the ground of delay and laches the main as well as the amended petition requires dismissal, petitioner at the interim stage has not placed true facts before this Court and has approached the Court with unclean hands, petitioner has deliberately misrepresented regarding rule position for his personal gains, objections were filed on behalf of respondents 2 and 3 on 23.12.2021 with advanced copy to the petitioner's counsel, even thereafter the case was listed number of times but petitioner



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

did not file the amended application which came to be filed after 06 months of filing of objections just to frustrate the promotional avenues of private respondent who is to retire in the year 2023. It is moreso contended, that petitioner by the amended application is trying to call in question Sports Council Order No. 22 of 2007 dated 15.01.2007 issued by respondent No. 3 vide which respondent No. 5 was retrospectively promoted as Selection Grade Coach and her seniority was restored at Sr. No. 01, petitioner has also challenged Sports Council Order No. 460 of 2013 dated 06.09.2013 whereby respondent No. 5 has been promoted as Grade-II Coach with restoration of her seniority ahead of one Nusrat Gazala by creating one supernumerary post of Grade-II Coach w.e.f. 20.06.2006, the most effected persons, namely, Nusrat Gazala, Farooq Ahmed Mir and Ravi Singh never approached the Hon'ble Court for re-fixation of their seniority because they were well aware of the seniority of respondent No. 5 by virtue of her 1st date of appointment to such service, petitioner by virtue of his amended application wants to improve upon his pleadings under the garb of amendment which cannot be allowed, as it is settled law that it would be wrong practice to allow and to include altogether a new relief as it would cause prejudice to the interest of respondents, petitioner in the main petition was aware of these orders and also mentioned regarding alleged illegalities of these orders but has chosen not to assail them in the original writ petition, therefore, has not given any reasonable justification in the amendment application. It is contended, that respondent No. 5 was never promoted directly to the post of Divisional Sports Officer from junior coach (selection grade) but was promoted retrospectively by virtue of her seniority as junior coach selection grade following due procedure and has been rightly promoted to the said post by virtue of order dated 18.12.2017 in view of her having been rendered 05 years of service as Manager, therefore, she is senior to the petitioner as being an appointee of 1988, while the petitioner is an appointee of 1989, prayer has been made for dismissal of the amendment application.



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

4. Respondent No. 5 has also opposed the amended application by contending therein, that in the original writ petition, petitioner has primarily challenged the promotion of the answering Respondent No. 5 to the post of Sports Officer by urging misleading facts and grounds that the petitioner is senior to respondent No. 5 and has better claims for promotion to the post of Sports Officer, the contentions of the petitioner are preposterous, thereby, writ petition requires to be dismissed with costs, petitioner has approached the Court with unclean hands and by placing misleading facts has obtained interim order dated 31.10.2018 whereby the Court has directed that respondent No. 5 shall not be considered for promotion to the post of Chief Sports Officer. It is contended, that by the medium of the amended writ petition, petitioner is trying to call in question the Sports Council Order No.22 of 2007 dated 15.01.2007 issued by the respondent No.3 vide which the respondent No. 5 has been retrospectively promoted as Selection Grade Coach and her seniority was restored at Sr. No. 1, coupled with challenge thrown to Sports Council Order No.460 of 2013 dated 06.09.2013 whereby the respondent No.5 has been promoted as Grade- II Coach with restoration of her seniority ahead of one Ms. Nusrat Gazala. It is moreso contended, that the petitioner at the time of filing of original writ petition has not challenged the aforesaid orders at the relevant point of time and even at the time of filing of the main petition and is therefore estopped to challenge the same through the medium of amended writ petition as per Order 6 Rule 17 CPC which contemplates that no application for amendment shall be allowed after the trial has commenced unless the Court comes to the conclusion that inspite of due diligence the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of trial, petitioner in the instant case was in know of passing of the orders and has deliberately not assailed these orders at the relevant point of time, the amended writ petition is therefore hit by delay and latches, the petitioner is trying to justify the illegalities which is an abuse of process of law otherwise also the petitioner has not given any reasonable justification in the application seeking amendment of the writ petition, respondent No. 5 has already filed objections to the main petition in detail



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

contending therein that promotion of respondent No. 5 as Junior Coach (Selection Grade), Grade-II Coach and Manager has been ordered from time to time and her seniority has also been maintained over and above the petitioner after re-fixing her seniority and by no stretch of imagination the petitioner could have superseded her for promotion to the post of Divisional Sports Officer, respondent No. 5 has rightly been promoted to the said post by virtue of impugned order dated 18.12.2017 in view of her having been rendered 5 years of service as Manager and also owing to the fact that she is senior to the petitioner being an appointee of 1988 while as the petitioner is an appointee of 1989, petitioner has misled this Court by not bringing true facts in its entirety and by making false statement before this Court that the respondent No. 5 does not fulfill the eligibility of 5 years of service as Divisional Sports Officer to be promoted as Chief Sports Officer, therefore has obtained the interim order dated 31.10.2018 when the fact remains that no such criteria of 5 years service is prescribed under rules, prayer has been made for dismissal of writ petition with exemplary costs.

5. Mr. Jagpaul Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner seeking the amendment of main writ petition bearing No. SWP 2248/2018 has vehemently canvassed arguments, that at the time of preferring the main petition petitioner was not in possession of endorsement No. SC/967/6004-05 dated 15.01.2007 and Sports Council Order No. 460 of 2013 dated 06.09.2013 as he tried his level best to get the aforesaid endorsement, but could not get the same and when official respondents filed their objections to the main writ petition and annexed the copies of the aforesaid endorsements with the objections, the aforesaid endorsements came in the knowledge of the petitioner and he immediately filed the amended application. It is argued, that as the adverse APRs of respondent No. 5 were never expunged by the competent authority, petitioner has also called in question the minutes of the Departmental Promotional Committee of J&K State Sports Council held on 22.04.2013 and Sports Council Order No. 22 of 2007 dated 15.01.2007 vide which the aforesaid endorsements were issued, under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

the amendment of pleadings could be permitted if it would result in solution of controversy between the parties without altering original cause of action and even the delay on its own untouched by fraud could not be ground for rejecting the application for amendment, however, the opposite party can be properly compensated with costs of such delay. It is moreso argued, that basic test which must govern grant or refusal of amendment is, “whether such amendment is necessary for determination of real question of controversy or for the proper and effective adjudication of the case, amendment should not cause prejudice to other side, which can even be compensated by money, Court should take into account the proposed amendment which should not change the nature and character of the case, even at belated stage, when the suit is ripe for trial, amendment has to be allowed subject to payment of cost that the dominant object of allowing amendment is to minimize the litigation and even the plea of limitation, if any, can be subject matter of issue after the amendment is allowed.” To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgments reported in, (i) 2000 (1) SCC 712 (B. K. Narayana Pillai **vs.** Parameshwaran Pillan and Anr.), (ii) 2009 (10) SCC 84 (Revajeetu Builders & Developers **vs.** Narayanswamy and Sons & Ors.), (iii) 2002 Supreme (SC) 299 (Fritiz T.M Clement & Anr. **vs.** Sudhakaran Nadar & Anr.) and (iv) 2001 (1) Supreme 328 (Ragu Thilak D. John **vs.** S. Rayappan & Ors.).

6. Ms. Anshuja Tak with Mr. Sheikh Najeeb, learned counsel for the respondents, per contra, have vehemently opposed the amendment application by projecting arguments, that respondent No. 5 is senior to the petitioner as she is appointee of the year of 1988 whereas the petitioner is appointee of the year of 1989, therefore, the writ petition needs to be dismissed in limine. It is argued, that there is a delay by the petitioner in questioning the seniority list which is fatal for the petitioner, therefore, the writ petition needs to be dismissed, a person aggrieved by the order of promotion should approach the Court at least within 06 months or at the most within 01 year of such promotion, however, in the case in hand the petitioner has approached the Court after a delay of 17



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

years, as respondent No. 5 was promoted in terms of Sports Council Order No. 22 of 2007 dated 15.01.2007 by respondent No. 3, there is delay and latches on the part of the petitioner on which count also the petition requires outright dismissal. It is moreso argued, that the amendment application has been preferred by the petitioner with ulterior motive to defeat the right of respondent No. 5, no reasonable justification has been given by the petitioner for seeking amendment, if the amendment will be allowed, it would be altogether a new relief, would be prejudicial to the respondent No. 5 as the same will change the nature of the petition and the relief claimed therein. In support of their arguments, learned counsel for the respondents have relied upon the judgments reported in, (i) (1984) 1 SCC 694 (Amar Kant Choudhary **vs.** State of Bihar & Ors.), (ii) 2009 (2) JKJ HC 97 (Gulshan Banday **vs.** State & Ors.), (iii) 2010 (4) JKJ 218 (G. M. Lone **vs.** Union of India), (iv) (2012) 6 SCC 430 (A. Shanmugam **vs.** Ariya Kshatriya Rajakula Vamsathu Madalaya Nandhavana Paripalanai & Ors.), (v) SLP (C) No. 21014 of 2004 (Raj Kumar Gurawara (dead) Thr. L.Rs. **vs.** M/S S. K. Sarwagi & Co. Pvt. Ltd. & Anr.), (vi) OWP No. 1353 decided on 16.12.2022 (Abdul Aziz Bhat **vs.** Mohammad Iqbal and Ors.) & (vii) Civil Appeal No. 189 of 2020 [SLP (C) No.5888/2019] (Pandit Malhari Mahale **vs.** Monika Pandit Mahale & Ors.).

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the contents of the amendment application, objections filed by the respondents and averments of the original writ petition. I have also gone through the relevant law on the subject matter and have perused the ratios of judgments relied upon by learned counsel for the parties. In 2009 (10) SCC 84 (Revajeetu Builders's & Developers **vs.** Narayan Swami & Sons and Others) relied by learned counsel for the petitioner, Hon'ble Supreme Court while discussing the scope and import of the principles of law governing the amendment of pleadings contained in Order 6 Rule 17 CPC, in paras 55, 57 to 68 held as under:-

“55. In Haridas Aildas Thadani & Others **vs.** Godraj Rustom Kermani, this Court said that;

"1.....It is well settled that the 19 (1974) 2 SCC 393 20 (1984) 1 SCC 668 **court should be extremely liberal in granting prayer for amendment of pleading unless serious**



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

injustice or irreparable loss is caused to the other side. It is also clear that a revisional court ought not to lightly interfere with a discretion exercised in allowing amendment in absence of cogent reasons or compelling circumstances”.

“57. In Suraj Prakash Bhasin v. Raj Rani Bhasin & Others, this Court held that:

“.....**liberal principles which guide the exercise of discretion in allowing amendment are that multiplicity of proceedings should be avoided**, that amendments which do not totally alter the character of an action should be readily granted while care should be taken to see that injustice and prejudice of an irremediable character are not inflicted on the opposite party under pretence of amendment, that one distinct cause of action should not be substituted for another and that the subject-matter of the suit should not be changed by amendment.”

Whether amendment is necessary to decide real controversy

58. The first condition which must be satisfied before the amendment can be allowed by the court is **whether such amendment is necessary for the determination of the real question in controversy**. If that condition is not satisfied, the amendment cannot be allowed. This is the basic test which should govern the courts' discretion in grant or refusal of the amendment.

No prejudice or injustice to other party

59. The other important condition which should govern the discretion of the Court is the potentiality of prejudice or injustice which is likely to be caused to the other side. Ordinarily, if the other side is compensated by costs, then there is no injustice but in practice hardly any court grants actual costs to the opposite side. The Courts have very wide discretion in the matter of amendment of pleadings but court's powers must be exercised judiciously and with great care.

60. In Ganga Bai's case (supra), this Court has rightly observed:

“22.....**The power to allow an amendment is undoubtedly wide and may at any stage be appropriately exercised in the interest of justice, the law of limitation notwithstanding**. But the exercise of such far-reaching discretionary powers is governed by judicial considerations and wider the discretion, greater ought to be the care and circumspection on the part of the court.”

Costs

61. The Courts have consistently laid down that for unnecessary delay and inconvenience, the opposite party must be compensated with costs. The imposition of costs is an important judicial exercise particularly when the courts deal with the cases of amendment. The costs cannot and should not be imposed arbitrarily. In our view, the following parameters must be taken into consideration while imposing the costs. These factors are illustrative in nature and not exhaustive.

- (i) At what stage the amendment was sought?
- (ii) While imposing the costs, it should be taken into consideration whether the amendment has been sought at a pre-trial or post-trial stage;
- (iii) The financial benefit derived by one party at the cost of the other party should be properly calculated in terms of money and the costs be awarded accordingly.
- (iv) The imposition of costs should not be symbolic but realistic;
- (v) The delay and inconvenience caused to the opposite side must be clearly evaluated in terms of additional and extra court hearings compelling the opposite party to bear the extra costs.



(vi) In case of appeal to higher courts, the victim of amendment is compelled to bear considerable additional costs.

All these aspects must be carefully taken into consideration while awarding the costs.

62. The purpose of imposing costs is to:

- a) Discourage malafide amendments designed to delay the legal proceedings
- b) Compensate the other party for the delay and the inconvenience caused;
- c) Compensate the other party for avoid-able expenses on the litigation which had to be incurred by opposite party for opposing the amendment; and
- d) To send a clear message that the parties have to be careful while drafting the original pleadings.

Factors to be taken into consideration while dealing with applications for amendments

63. On critically analyzing both the English and Indian cases, some basic principles emerge which ought to be taken into consideration while allowing or rejecting the application for amendment.

- (1) Whether the amendment sought is imperative for proper and effective adjudication of the case
- (2) Whether the application for amendment is bona fide or malafide?
- (3) The amendment should not cause such prejudice to the other side which cannot be compensated adequately in terms of money
- (4) Refusing amendment would in fact lead to injustice or lead to multiple Litigation
- (5) Whether the proposed amendment constitutionally or fundamental
- (6) As a general rule, the court should decline amendments if a fresh suit on the amended claims would be barred by limitation on the date of application.

These are some of the important factors which may be kept in mind while dealing with application filed under Order VI Rule 17. These are only illustrative and not exhaustive.

64. The decision on an application made under Order VI Rule 17 is a very serious judicial exercise and the said exercise should never be undertaken in a casual manner. We can conclude our discussion by observing that while deciding applications for amendments the courts must not refuse bona fide, legitimate, honest and necessary amendments and should never permit mala fide, worthless and/or dishonest amendments.”

Ratio of the judgment (supra) makes the legal proposition abundantly clear, “that the Courts should be extremely liberal in granting prayer of amendment of pleadings at any stage unless serious injustice or irreparable loss is caused to other side, multiplicity of proceedings should be avoided, amendment should be necessary to decide real controversy for proper and effective adjudication of the case and should be bona fide, refusing in amendment would in fact lead to injustice or multiplicity of litigation however the other side be compensated by costs if no injustice is caused, even if there is a delay and the amendment is time bound the delay should be compensated by costs and the



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

amendment allowed where after the limitation would be an issue in the proceedings, the proposed amendment fundamentally should not change the nature and character of the case.” In 2000 (1) SCC 712 (B. K. Narayana Pillai vs. Parameshwaran Pillan and Anr.), relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner, Hon’ble Supreme Court permitted to amend the written statements by appellant/defendant to the extent of incorporating the plea of his entitlement to the benefit of Section 60 (b) of the Indian Easements Act 1882 subject to payment of costs. In 2002 Supreme (SC) 299 (Fritz T.M Clement & Anr. vs. Sudhakaran Nadar & Anr.) relied upon by the learned counsel for petitioner, appellants-plaintiffs were permitted to carry out the amendments in the plaint, even though there was delay and lapses but subject to award of costs to be paid to the respondents-defendants. In 2001 (1) Supreme 328 (Ragu Thilak D. John vs. S. Rayappan & Ors.) also relied by learned counsel for petitioner, Hon’ble Supreme Court allowed the amendment even though it was barred by limitation by observing that dominant object of allowing amendment is to minimize litigation, plea of limitation could be made a subject matter of issue after allowing amendment.

8. Ratios of the judgments (supra) relied by learned counsel for petitioner and the principles of law enunciated therein squarely apply to the facts of the case in hand. It is apt to reiterate here, that the original writ petition being SWP No. 2248/2018 filed by the petitioner in the year 2018 is pending disposal before this Court. In the amended application which is supported by an affidavit making a prima facie case in favour of the petitioner, it has been specifically averred that the core issue involved in the writ petition is in respect to seniority and promotion of respondent No. 5 to the post of Manager wherein the petitioner has called in question the minutes of meeting of Departmental Promotion Committee of J&K State Sports Council held on 22.04.2013. It is borne in mind that as per the averments of the amended application, petitioner at the time of preferring the original writ petition was not in possession of endorsement No. SC/967/6004-05 dated 15.01.2007 and Sports Council Order No. 460 of 2013 dated 06.09.2013 and the same



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

endorsements came in his knowledge at the time when respondents including respondents 2 & 3 filed their objection to the main writ petition alongwith the said endorsements, and immediately after the objections filed by respondents 2 and 3, petitioner preferred instant amended application on 25.05.2022 to the extent of challenge of Sports council order aforesaid. It is unambiguously reiterated here, that the real question in controversy between the parties needs to be determined for proper and effective adjudication of the case and the proposed amendment fundamentally in my considered view would not change the nature and character of the main petition, as the core issue regarding the promotion of respondent No. 5 to the post of Manager would be determined effectively by allowing the proposed amendment. Even if there is a delay on the part of the petitioner, but the same is untouched by any fraud and therefore could not be a ground for rejecting the amendment application and the opposite party could be properly compensated for such delay. The dominant object of the proposed amendment is to minimize the litigation between the parties and the endeavor of the Court must be that rejection of the amendment would not result in multiplicity of the litigation, and even if the plea of limitation is there, amendment should be allowed and plea of limitation could be an issue after amendment.

9. The case laws relied upon by learned counsel for the respondents relate to the limitation in filing the main petition and would be considered at the time of final disposal of the writ petition, however, the amendment application at this stage of the proceedings in the writ petition requires to be allowed for determining the real controversy between the parties in regard to the promotion of respondent No. 5.

10. In view of the forgoing discussion, I am of the considered opinion that the application for amendment of the main writ petition is within the parameters of the ratios of the judgments (supra) relied upon by learned counsel for petitioner, as a legal right has accrued to the petitioner which should not be defeated, the delay even if on part of the petitioner is untouched by fraud and should not be a ground for rejecting the amendment application, while the opposite



2020:JKLHC-JMU:10342

party should be properly compensated with costs for such delay. This being so, amendment application is allowed, petitioner is permitted to amend the main petition SWP No. 2248/2018, however, subject to the payment of costs of Rs. 5000/- to be paid to respondent No. 5. Petitioner has placed on record the amended writ petition which is taken on record. Copies of the amended writ petition be forthwith provided by the learned counsel for the petitioner to counsel for the opposite side for filing the objections if any.

11. Amendment application is, **accordingly disposed of.**
12. List the main petition for consideration on 20.02.2023.

(Mohan Lal)
Judge

Jammu
31.01.2023
Bir

