

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14.10.2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.**JUSTICE D.HARIPARANTHAMAN**

C.R.P (PD) No.4069 of 2015

and M.P.No.1 of 2015

R.Jayaraman

... Petitioner

VS.

1.T.Anandanayagi

2.Marie Joseph George De Canaga

.... Respondents

Civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the order dated 11.8.2015 in RCA No.4 of 2015 on the file of the learned Principal District Judge of Puducherry.

For petitioner : Mr.P.Veeraraghavan

ORDER

The second respondent herein is the landlord and the revision petitioner is the tenant. The second respondent filed H.R.C.O.P.No.23 of 2007 for eviction alleging that the revision petitioner committed wilful default.

2. While so, the first respondent herein filed an application in I.A.No.74 of 2013 in H.R.C.O.P.No.23 of 2007 to implead her as a party as she has purchased the property from the second respondent herein. However, the learned Rent Controller dismissed I.A.No.74 of 2013 in H.R.C.O.P.No.23 of 2007 on 12.3.2015. Thereafter, the first respondent filed an appeal in R.C.A.No.4 of 2015 before the appellate authority. The appellate authority allowed the said RCA on 11.8.2015. The present revision petition is filed against the aforesaid order.

3. I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioner.

4. When this Court put a question as to whether the second respondent disputes about the contention made by the first respondent as to the title of the property, it is admitted by the learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioner that the second respondent does not dispute the title and the second respondent did not object the application made by the first respondent in I.A.No.74 of 2013 in H.R.C.O.P.No.23 of 2007.

5. I have also perused the order of the appellate authority.

6. The appellate authority gave cogent reasons for allowing the appeal in R.C.A.No.4 of 2015. In my view, no prejudice would be caused to the revision petitioner by impleading the first respondent as a party in H.R.C.O.P.No.23 of 2007. Hence, I am not inclined to interfere with the order of the appellate authority.

7. In the result, the order of the learned Principal District Judge of Puducherry, dated 11.8.2015 made in RCA No.4 of 2015 is confirmed and the civil revision petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

14.10.2015

Index:Yes/No
sbi

To

1.The Principal District Judge,
Puducherry.

D.HARIPARANTHAMAN,J.

sbi

C.R.P(PD) No.4069 of 2015

DATED: 14.10.2015