

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

CR No.626 of 2014
Date of decision : 15.02.2016

Krishan Kumar and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Lal Chand and ors.

...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: Mr. P.K. Chugh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Madhu Ranjan, Advocate for
Mr. Rakesh Dhiman, Advocate for respondents.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The defendant Nos.1 and 2 is aggrieved of the order, whereby application filed by the respondent Nos.1 and 2 for impleadment as party in the suit on the concession made by the plaintiff, has been allowed.

Mr. P.K. Chugh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner-defendant Nos.1 & 2 submits that application was filed at the fag end of the trial. It would tantamounts to denovo trial as defendant at the instance of the plaintiff being dragged into litigation, should not be made to suffer more & thus, prays for setting aside of the order.

Mr. Madhu Ranjan, Advocate for Mr. Rakesh Dhiman, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents submits that there is no illegality and perversity in the order. The plaintiff is dominus litus and has suffered statement and, therefore order under challenge cannot be stated to have been passed without jurisdiction.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and appraised the paper book.

Application under Order 1 Rule 10 has been allowed on the concession of the plaintiff who is dominus litus. No prejudice seems to have been caused to the defendants. Defendant has no right challenging the impleadment as party when there is no clash of the interest.

With the aforementioned observations, impugned order is affirmed.

Revision petition is dismissed.

15.02.2016

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**