



CRM-M-44328-2025

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

123

CRM-M-44328-2025
Date of Decision:-18.08.2025

Pankaj Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

Manjit Kaur and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Mr. R.S. Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed raising challenge to the order dated 15.07.2025 (Annexure P-7) passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Jalandhar, whereby, the application filed by the petitioner for dismissing the amended application under Section 12 of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act (hereinafter referred to as "DV Act") has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent had filed a complaint under Section 12 of DV Act in which the columns of the monetary relief were left blank. Subsequently, respondent No. 1 filed an application for amendment of a complaint in which she prayed that the monetary relief claimed under Section 20 of DV Act were left blank inadvertently, should be permitted to be filled and the respondent No.1



CRM-M-44328-2025

2

specifically in the column ***“loss due to destruction/ damage or removal of property from the control of the aggrieved person”*** mentioned the amount claimed was NIL.

3. However, after the application was allowed on 25.07.2024, the respondent No.1 while filing the amended petition added a claim of Rs. 2,50,000/- against the above stated clause but the same was never prayed for.

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length and have gone through the paper book. The only ground raised by the petitioner is that the respondent No. 1 could not have been permitted to amend the petition beyond what she had prayed for and what was allowed.

5. However, a perusal of the order dated 15.07.2025 needs to be reproduced, which reads as under:

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, case file is perused. From the perusal of file and particularly the amended petition, it is clear that the petitioner has added the particular amount of monetary relief in his petition upon the application for amendment was allowed by the Ld. Predecessor Court. Moreover, there is no reason as to why the monetary reliefs which have now been filled up by the petitioner should not be permitted to be claimed by her. It is also correct that applicant has not cited any law to support his contentions.

6. Admittedly, the order dated 25.07.2024 has never been challenged by the petitioner and more so, the objection raised by the petitioner is too hyper-technical. Furthermore, the petitioner will always have a right to rebut the amendments made by the respondents before the



CRM-M-44328-2025

3

Court of Competent Jurisdiction.

7. In light of the above, considering the fact that rules are handmaids of justice and the substantial relief cannot be denied only on account of certain inadvertent errors which might have been caused by the counsel, this Court do not find any merit in the present petition and hence, the same stands dismissed.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

August 18, 2025

Parul

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:-	Yes/No