

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 6175 of 2015 (O/M)
Date of decision : 18.9.2015

Satbir

..... Revisionist

Versus

The Managing Director HSIDC and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Johan Kumar, Advocate, for the revisionist.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

:-

:-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Impugned in the present revision is the order dated 26.8.2015 (Annexure-P-4), passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Sonapat, vide which the application of the plaintiff/revisionist herein under Order 1 Rule 10 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (in short 'CPC') for impleading Public Health Department as defendant, was dismissed.

I have heard the learned counsel for the revisionist and have also carefully gone through the file.

It comes out from the impugned order that the objection

CR No. 6175 of 2015 (O/M)

was taken in the written statement filed way back on 22.4.2013 to the effect that the entire system of sewerage, drainage and water supply is being looked after by the Public Health Department since the inception of Industrial Area, Sonapat. Despite that, the said department was not made party. Now, the case is stated to be fixed for rebuttal evidence and arguments. Allowing this application would mean that the case will go back to service stage. Even after taking the objection in the written statement, the plaintiff/revisionist has been pursuing the case. He led the evidence and also cross-examined the witness of other party. Therefore, at the arguments stage, I do not see any reason to allow the application to add any party.

The present revision is accordingly dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

18.9.2015
sjks