

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

CR No.5860 of 2015

Date of decision : 18.03.2016

Raj Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Nirmala Midha and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment ?
2. To be referred to reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Ms. Aditi Girdhar, Advocate for
Mr. M.S. Khillan, Advocate for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Challenge in the present revision petition is to the impugned order, whereby application for impleading Raj kumar son of Vishan Dass as respondent No.4 and to give up respondent No.4-Ved Parkash from the array of respondents, has been allowed.

The contention of the petitioner is that the election petition is to be filed within a limitation of 30 days which was filed on 22.03.2013 whereas written statement was filed on 06.04.2013 and application for impleading (Annexure P-2) was filed on 08.04.2013 for impleading Raj kumar son of Vishan Dass as respondent No.4 and to give up respondent

No.4-Ved Parkash from the array of respondents.

In my view, application cannot be said to be time barred as the application has been filed within one month of the filing of the election petition. However, it would be subject to the provision of Section 21 of the Limitation Act which issue shall be decided by the trial Court at the final stage not at this stage.

In view of the aforementioned fact, the order dated 12.08.2015 (Annexure P-3), is hereby affirmed.

No ground for interference.

Dismissed.

18.03.2016

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**