

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.7725 of 2015
Date of Decision: 19.11.2015.

Smt. Paramjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

Municipal Committing Nissing and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Virender Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Impugned in the present revision is the order dated 18.08.2015, passed by the learned Civil Judge, Junior Division, Karnal, vide which the application under Order 1 Rule 10 of respondents No.5 to 12 was allowed and they were added as defendants.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that suit is for permanent injunction. Therefore, these applicants cannot become party against his wishes. No relief is claimed against them. The perusal of the plaint Annexure P-2 shows that dispute is regarding the passage and relief is claimed against the Municipal Committee

and some other private persons. Since the applicants, now defendants No.5 to 12, had claimed before the Lower Court that they are also served by the said passage and that any decree passed against the Municipal Committee is likely to be implemented against them also, therefore, in my view that they are necessary party and have been rightly added as defendants.

Accordingly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

November 19, 2015

Ankur

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**