

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 29/10/2025

Rahman Khan Vs The State of Madhya Pradesh

W.P. No. 6924 Of 2014

Court: Madhya Pradesh High Court

Date of Decision: May 9, 2014

Acts Referred:

Civil Procedure Code, 1908 (CPC) â€" Order 6 Rule 17#Constitution of India, 1950 â€" Article

227

Citation: (2014) 05 MP CK 0145

Hon'ble Judges: Sanjay Yadav, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Arvind Shrivastava, learned counsel, Advocate for the Appellant

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Sanjay Yadav, J. Heard on admission.

2. Order dated 10.4.2014 passed in Civil Suit No. 14 A/2014 by First Civil Judge Class I, Tikamgarh is being assailed vide this writ petition under

Article 227 of the Constitution of India; whereby, an application under Order 6 Rule 17, Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 seeking amendment in the

plaint has been rejected.

3. Suit by the petitioner/plaintiff is for declaration of title and permanent injunction as regard to land marked as ABCD in the plaint map of Khasra

No. 362, Kumedan Mohalla, Nazar Bagh, Tikamgarh, on the contention that he is in possession thereof. Petitioner/plaintiff filed an application

under Order 6 Rule 17, CPC seeking amendment in paragraph 12 of the plaint contending that he wants to elaborate the pleadings.

4. Trial Court vide impugned order rejected the application holding that since there is no pleadings in the plaint that he perfected the title by

adverse possession, he cannot be allowed to change the pleading in the light of the fact that the plaintiff has been proceeded against for

encroachment and has been penalized. The trial court observed:

5. It has been held in A.K. Gupta and Sons Vs. Damodar Valley Corporation, that ""7...... The general rule, no doubt, is that a party is not allowed

by amendment to set up a new case or a new cause of action particularly when a suit on new case or cause of action is barred...."".

6. In view whereof the rejection of an application under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC by the Trial Court does not suffer from jurisdictional error as would

warrant an interference.

7. Consequently, petition fails and is dismissed.