

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

**C.R. No.225 of 2014
Date of Decision.29.04.2015**

Naresh Inder SinghPetitioner
Versus

M/s Authentic Properties Pvt. Ltd.Respondent

Present: Mr. Dharminder Singh Randhawa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Gupta, Advocate
for the respondent.

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 petition for amendment was sought by the plaintiff in suit for specific performance to challenge the transfer made in favour of the defendant. The transfer was purported to be subsequent to the agreement which was sought to be enforced. A subsequent purchaser is a necessary party under Section 19 of the Specific Relief Act and if the subsequent transferee was already a party and there was a specific prayer sought for annulling the transfer, I do not think any prejudice could be said to be caused. The Court below has allowed for such a challenge to be brought through an amendment and I will find no reason for causing any interference with the same.

2. The order is maintained and the civil revision is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

**April 29, 2015
Pankaj***

