



Civil Procedure Code, 1908 (V of 1908) Order 6, Rule 17 - Petitioner has merely stated that inadvertently and due to sheer slip, some lines had been left out in the [written statement](#) - No doubt, the petitioner was not required to mention the words "due diligence" in the said application but at the same time it was incumbent upon her to show by way of necessary averments that on account of some intervening circumstances, the relevant facts could not be mentioned or came to be omitted at the first instance despite exercise of due diligence - It cannot be digested that the petitioner being mother-in-law of respondent No.1 would have been unaware that after the death of her son, respondent No.1 i.e. her daughter-in-law had remarried - Petition dismissed.

... [subscribe](#) TO CONTINUE READING !!!! SPECIAL LIMITED TIME OFFER !!!!

Subscribe Punjab Law Reporter @ Rs 2800/- and get PLRonline.IN (including Supreme Court) FREE for 1 year (save Rs 600/-)

[Login](#) or [Join Now](#)

Full Text of Judgments / Headnotes / PDF is available in Premium Membership | Email punjablawreporter@gmail.com | 9463598502 | Trial membership for 7 days |

[SUBSCRIBE](#)

Tags: [\(2022-4\)208 PLR 745](#), [CPC O. 6 R. 17](#), [SURJIT KAUR v. HARPINDER KAUR](#)