

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

PARAMJIT KAUR SAINI
2016.02.24 13:31
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

Civil Revision No.1231 of 2016
Date of Decision: 18.2.2016

Arjun Dass

---Petitioner

versus

Sarla Devi and others

---Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: Mr. P. R. Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner

1. Whether Reporters of local papers 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?

Rekha Mittal, J.

The present petition lays challenge to order dated 22.01.2016 passed by the trial Court whereby the application filed by Sarla Devi respondent No.1 for impleading her as one of the defendants on the premise of being a transferee pendente lite vide sale deed No. 4843 dated 06.01.2014, has been allowed.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that Smt. Samina respondent No. 3 (defendant No.2) filed the written statement on 08.08.2012 but she did not disclose that she has already sold the suit property to Rajesh Kumar on 22.12.2011. Respondent No. 1 has claimed ownership on the basis of sale deed dated 06.01.2014 purported to be executed in her favour by said Rajesh Kumar. The application for impleading Sarla Devi as a party has been filed through the same Advocate,

representing Smt. Samina defendant No. 2 in the suit. It is argued that the present application has been filed with an ulterior motive to delay the proceedings.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner, perused the records and find no merit in the petition.

The controversy raised in the present petition is squarely covered by judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India **Thomson Press (India) Limited vs. Nanak Builders & Investors Private Limited and others 2013(2) R.C.R.(Civil) 875**, wherein the Hon'ble Court has held that transferee pendente lite is entitled to be impleaded as a party to protect his/her interest in the pending litigation. In this view of the matter, no fault can be found in the impugned order as would call for intervention.

Dismissed.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

18.2.2016
PARAMJIT