



\$~69

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

*Date of Decision: 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2025*+ CM(M) 991/2025 & CM APPL. 32754-32755/2025  
VISHAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Lakra, Advocate.

versus

KRISHAN LAMBA

.....Respondent

Through: None.

**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN****J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Petitioner is defending a suit which seeks mandatory and permanent injunction.
2. As per the prayer contained in the plaint, the plaintiff sought decree of injunction with respect to suit property which was described as “*Khasra No.28/21/1, Mange Ram Park, Pooth Kalan, Delhi-110086*” *ad-measuring 121 sq. yards.*
3. After the written statement was filed by the defendant (petitioner herein), the plaintiff moved an application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC with the limited prayer that on account of typographical error, the plot number was not mentioned though the Khasra number was mentioned.
4. Accordingly, he prayed that while the other details of the property would remain the same, he may be permitted to mention the plot No. as “Plot No.35”.



5. The grievance raised in the present petition is with respect to order dated 01.03.2025 whereby such amendment has been allowed.
6. On the face of it, the amendment is on account of some inadvertent typographical error, and the petitioner is not changing the relief or the nature of the suit in any manner whatsoever and there is no *mala fide* involved either.
7. The plaintiff has, in no uncertain terms apprised the learned Trial Court that the other particulars of the property would remain the same and he is only supplying the plot number which, somehow, was not mentioned, when the suit was filed.
8. The learned Trial Court has, therefore, rightly allowed the abovesaid request holding that it was necessary for proper adjudication of the disputes between the parties.
9. As already noticed above, the case is at the initial stage only as issues have yet not been framed.
10. View thus, this Court does not find any illegality or perversity in the impugned order.
11. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed *in limine*.
12. Needless to say as and when an amended written statement is filed, the petitioner would be at liberty to incorporate all such objections in the amended written statement.
13. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of in abovesaid terms.

**(MANOJ JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**MAY 26, 2025/ss/pb**