

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

**C.R. No.1586 of 2016
Date of Decision.01.03.2016**

Rakesh KumarPetitioner
Vs.
Kewal Krishan and othersRespondents

Present: Mr. Arun Abrol, 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. The petitioner who was sued for ejectment contends that his father was actually in possession of the shop and that he was not in possession and the court below has wrongly allowed the application for impleadment. Although the written statement contains this plea, the plaintiff did not take any steps to implead Nand Kishore Sharma, petitioner's father till then the evidence was closed and the case was posted for arguments. It is fair enough that the Court has allowed the impleadment of the party who would be necessary for securing judicial adjudication in the light of the contentions made. Although the Court has found that there has been a delay, it has allowed the impleadment by imposition of costs of ₹2000/-. The Court has exercised the discretion in the manner which is appropriate.

2. There is no illegality in the order passed for interference in the revision petition. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 01, 2016

Pankaj*