

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

**C.R. No.4838 of 2015
Date of Decision.03.08.2015**

Manoj KumarPetitioner

Versus

Om Dutt and othersRespondents

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh-I, 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. There is nothing for the defendant to complain that the plaintiff could not have taken steps to implead the legal representatives. According to him, Order 22 Rule 2B of Punjab and Haryana High Court Amendment casts a duty only on the legal representatives of the defendant to take steps and not on the person who is *dominus litus*. This provision cannot be understood that if the plaintiff takes steps to implead the legal representatives, it will be incompetent. This provision is purely facilitative and no objection could be made letting the plaintiff go as abated for not taking steps. It does not bar a plaintiff himself to take steps to implead legal representatives. The objection taken was untenable and rightly rejected.

2. There is no ground for making an intervention in the revision petition. The civil revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

**August 03, 2015
Pankaj***