

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

CR No. 1788 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision: January 21, 2016

Bala and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Shardhananad and others

...Respondents

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?**

Present: Mr. Ravinder Hooda, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. In a suit for injunction brought by the plaintiff against the father, the daughter sought impleadment because the father said in his written statement that the daughter is also a necessary party. I cannot understand how an injunction relief sought by the brother should be examined only in the presence of the daughter, if the plaintiff has no apprehension of his rights being threatened at the instance of the daughter. The plaintiff is the dominus litus and he is entitled to choose the defendants against whom he wants relief and if the court below has not allowed the impleadment, I have no reason to take a different view.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

January 21, 2016
prem

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE