

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.RAMACHANDRA RAO

CRP No.4291 of 2015

ORDER :

This Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order dt.18.08.2015 in I.A.No.792 in 2014 in O.S.No.75 of 2007 of the Judge, Family Court-cum-VII Additional District and Sessions Judge, Medak at Sangareddy.

2. The petitioners herein are third parties to the suit. The respondents 1 to 13 filed the above suit against respondents 14 to 21 for partition of the suit schedule properties. Pending the suit, the petitioners purchased a portion of the suit schedule properties under a registered sale deed dt.13.03.2013.

3. Having come to know of this, the respondents 1 to 13/plaintiffs filed I.A.No.792 of 2014 to implead the petitioners as defendants 9 to 11 in the suit.

4. Counter affidavit was filed by the petitioners opposing the said impleadment and stating that pursuant to the sale deed dt.13.03.2013, they have purchased a portion of the suit schedule properties. They pointed out that an extent of Ac.3-29 guntas also forming part of suit schedule properties was sold pending suit in favour of one Madhava Reddy but as far as that extent is concerned, the respondents 1 to 13 have filed a memo stating that they are not pressing the claim in the suit and this indicates collusion among the respondents.

5. By order dt.18.08.2015, the Court below allowed the said application. It observed that if the petitioners are impleaded in the suit, it will be useful for them to project their case and put up their defence and protect their interest therein.

6. Challenging the same, this Revision is filed.

7. Although counsel for the petitioners sought to contend that the petitioners have been unnecessarily impleaded in the suit, I am of the opinion that since the petitioners have purchased a portion of the suit schedule properties pending suit, it is in their own interest to be impleaded so that they can contest the suit and protect their investments.

8. Therefore, I do not find any merit in this Civil Revision Petition and it is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

9. Consequently, Miscellaneous Petitions pending if any, shall stand closed.

M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO, J

09th October, 2015.

gra