

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

Date of Reserve: 3rd February, 2010
Date of Order: 22nd March, 2010

CM(M) No. 42/2010

%

22.03.2010

Sonia Singh

... Petitioner

Through: Mr. V.K.Mishra, Advocate

Versus

Manmohin Kaur & Ors.

... Respondents

JUSTICE SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporter or not?
3. Whether judgment should be reported in Digest?

JUDGMENT

By this petition, the petitioner has assailed order dated 18th November, 2009 whereby her application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC to be impleaded as a party in a suit filed by the respondents was dismissed.

2. This Court in CM(M) No. 119/2010 has already observed that the order passed by the learned ADJ was within its jurisdiction and did not suffer from infirmity.

3. The respondent had let out premises to Frick India Limited. Mrs. Sonia Singh, wife of one of the Directors claimed that she was in possession of the premises and she was a necessary party. The learned ADJ observed that the agreement clearly reflected that the landlord had inducted Petitioner Company as a tenant. The agreement did not specify that it was for residence of Mrs. Sonia Singh and her husband. There was no privity of contract between the applicant and the landlord, neither the landlord had

recognized applicant or her husband as tenant so she was not a necessary party and the application was dismissed.

4. I find that the order of the trial Court is self speaking and perfectly justified. The petition is hereby dismissed.

March 22, 2010
vn

SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA, J.