

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

C.R. No.1462 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision.04.03.2016

Harish Kumar

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Arun Kumar Khanna and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Narang, 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)

C.M. No.4924-CII of 2016

Application is allowed.

The case is taken up for hearing today itself.

C.R. No.1462 of 2016

1. The plaintiff in the suit who claimed lease hold interest in property as purchaser from Parwati Kaur from one Jagan Nath filed application for impleadment which was dismissed. The suit had been filed by the plaintiff against the admitted owner of the property for the relief of injunction. At the time of cross-examination of the defendant, it appears that the land owner admitted that Jagan Nath had other legal heirs. He, therefore, wanted to implead the other legal representatives of Jagan Nath.

2. I find absolutely no reason why the plaintiff must bring other legal heirs of Jagan Nath, for Parwati Kaur is purchaser from Jagan Nath

himself and the question of heirship of Jagan Nath does not arise. Again the interest which the defendant claims as owner is completely different from any right which Jagan Nath's legal heirs can claim when Jagan Nath himself held only a lease hold interest.

3. The impleadment sought was without any legal basis and if the application was dismissed by the Court below, I find no reason for interference. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 04, 2016
Pankaj*