



CR No. 7030 of 2025

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

CR-7030-2025 (O&M)  
Decided on: 30.09.2025

Krishan Lal Popli

.....Petitioner

Versus

Girish Chander @ Girish Grover  
(since deceased) through his LRs

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: Ms. Parul Saini, Advocate, for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

Petitioner herein is the respondent-tenant before the learned Rent Controller, Kurukshetra in the rent petition No.3 of 2020, titled Girish Chander @ Girish Grover Vs. Krishan Lal Popli. He is aggrieved by the order dated 27.05.2025 (Annexure P-5), whereby his application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC for amendment of the written statement has been declined.

2. Ejectment of the tenant was sought by the landlord on the ground of non-payment of rent and bonafide necessity. Both the parties concluded their evidence and the case was at the final stage, when the application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC was moved by the tenant i.e. petitioner herein seeking amendment of the written statement to the effect that at the time of filing of the petition, son of the landlord had already started raising construction of a four storied building at Shardanand Chowk, Near Sethi Nursing Home and that during pendency of the petition, the said construction has been completed.

3. Learned Rent Controller has rightly declined the prayer for amendment after observing that the contents of the application itself revealed that the tenant i.e. petitioner herein was well aware even at the time of filing of the petition that son of the landlord had started raising construction of four storied building near Sethi Nursing Home. It is also

**CR No. 7030 of 2025**

observed that at the fag end, when the case had reached at the final stage, the amendment could not have been allowed, particularly when the tenant did not exercise due diligence at the relevant time.

4. The petition was filed way back in January, 2020 and more than 05 years and 08 months have expired. Simply because the subsequent events can be brought to the notice of the Court, as is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner, cannot be a reason to grant permission to the tenant to amend his written statement which are likely to delay the proceedings further.

5. Considering all the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court does not find any illegality or perversity in the impugned order. As such, finding no merit in the instant petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

**30.09.2025***Jiten***(DEEPAK GUPTA)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No