

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

C.R. No.2871 of 2015

Date of Decision.29.04.2015

Mukut Bihari

.....Petitioner

Versus

Subhash Chander (deceased) through LR's and anotherRespondents

Present: Mr. Ashwani Bakshi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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 civil revision is against the impleadment of subsequent purchaser in a suit for specific performance. A subsequent purchaser is always a necessary party under Section 19 of the Specific Relief Act. If the suit for specific performance has been filed against the vendor within time and if subsequent purchaser is brought on record subsequently, I cannot take an argument that the suit will be barred against the subsequent purchaser. If there is such a bar, it will be open to the defendant to make such contention but I will find no reason for interfering with the order that allows for impleadment of necessary party.

2. The civil revision is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

April 29, 2015
Pankaj*