

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

C.R. No.6601 of 2016

Date of Decision.04.10.2016

Jagdish son of Sh. Puran

.....Petitioner

Vs

Satyawan and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Manoj Chahal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

The petitioner-defendant No.1 is aggrieved of the impugned order whereby the application filed by the plaintiff that defendant No.2 Jai Pal has been made party as pro forma defendant but inadvertently one Chawli daughter of Har Chand was not impleaded in the case and therefore, seeking her impleadment, has been allowed.

Mr. Manoj Chahal, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the decree is of the year 1990 and the suit has been filed in 2011 and therefore, the application was totally misconceived and devoid of merit.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book. The person sought to be impleaded as defendant was also co-defendant in the aforementioned decree. Since she is a co-owner in the property, therefore, the suit challenging the decree could not have been decided in her absence, rightly so, the application has been allowed, by taking into consideration that the application was belated, the Court has imposed costs of ₹2000/- as well.

I do not find any reason to differ with the order under challenge

passed by the Court below, much less, the order cannot be said to be passed without jurisdiction. No ground for interference is made out. The revision petition is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

October 04, 2016
Pankaj*

Whether reasoned/speaking	Yes
Whether reportable	No