

Ö

SLP(C)No. 14184 OF 2001
ITEM No.35

Court No. 9

SECTION IVB
A/N MATTER

@@

[[

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No.14184/2001

(From the judgement and order dated 18/08/2000 in CR 3296/2000
of The HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH)

PREM AGGARWAL

Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

MOHAN SINGH

Respondent (s)

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

Date : 10/03/2003 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVARAJ V. PATIL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARIJIT PASAYAT

For Petitioner (s)

In-person

For Respondent (s)

Mr. R. Venkataramani, Sr.Adv.
Ms. Naresh Bakshi,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J
.SP2

Heard petitioner-in-person. He states that he has taken no objection from the Advocate-on-record to argue the case by himself.

The order of the High Court in dismissing the revision petition, which was filed challenging the order of the trial court alongwith the amendment of the written statement filed by the defendent, is under challaenge. The petitioner urged that the suit is pending for a long

..2/-

.PA

.2.

time, i.e., since 1990; the defendent has been making one or the other application just to delay the proceedings; the Trial Court committed an error in allowing such an application for amendment, so also the High Court in dismissing the review petition.

Learned Senior Counsel representing the respondent submitted that the impugned order is perfectly justified.

He fairly submitted, on our asking that no oral evidence shall be led consequent upon the amendment of the written statement on the application of the defendant.

We do not find any good ground to interfere with the impugned order. Hence, the special leave petition is dismissed. However, we direct the trial court to dispose of the suit within a period of six months from the date of the receipt of the copy of this order, making it clear that the defendant shall not be permitted to lead any oral evidence on account of the amendment of the written statement.

.SP1

Sarita

(Shelly Sengupta)
Court Master