

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

CR No. 1061 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: April 21, 2015

Rajinder Parkash Yadav and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Abhay Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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

Present: Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunil Garg, Advocate,
for respondents No.1 and 2.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is a third party to the suit who sought for impleadment contending that he had direct interest in the property and the suit for injunction has been filed by the plaintiffs against defendants No. 1 to 9 who have no interest at all in the property. Where a suit is mainly for injunction, the plaintiff shall only be the person who will decide on the persons from whom he would seek protection from the court. No third party can force himself in such proceedings and seek for adjudication on his title. If the petitioner has an apprehension that the plaintiffs may use a decree that they may obtain against defendants No. 1 to 9 to their advantage and deny the petitioner's own title, the petitioner may use the fact of pendency of the suit at the instance of the plaintiffs as affording an occasion that his legal

character is being denied and seek for declaration in the manner contemplated under Section 34 of the Specific Relief Act. with or without ancillary relief.

2. I find no merit in the revision petition. The order already passed is maintained.

April 21, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE