

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.1460 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of Decision.21.04.2015

Nawal Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Roopan alias Roopwati and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Rohit Ahuja, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiv Kumar, Advocate
for the 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?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The purchaser pursuant to an agreement sought for an impleadment in a suit where the sisters of the petitioner-vendor's husband filed a suit for declaration challenging the Will said to have been executed by the father and the decree and mutation that have taken place subsequently. The purchaser wants to come on record only because her own vendors were supporting him and they are alleged to be colluding with the plaintiff and his rights will be seriously prejudiced if the defence is not entered to sustain title transferred in his favour. The Court ought to have allowed the petition and it was wrong on its part to fend off the attempt on the part of the purchaser to enter the fray and bring his own defence.

2. The impugned order is erroneous and it is set aside. The

petitioner will be permitted to file his statement if it has not already been done within two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order and shall also have the opportunity to recall the witnesses examined on the side of the plaintiff for cross-examination and the defendant will also have opportunity to examine himself and offer his evidence. The Court shall dispose of the case in accordance with law after bringing on record the respective evidence of parties.

3. The civil revision is allowed on the above terms.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

April 21, 2015
Pankaj*