

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

CR No.2241 of 2016
Date of decision : 08.11.2017

Tara Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Sunil Kumar and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. G.S. Jagpal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Salil Sablok, Advocate for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Mr. Sumeet S. Brar, Advocate for respondent No.3.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

The plaintiff had filed an application for impleading Smt. Vandana Sharma, the alleged owner of the adjoining property as party defendant in a suit for injunction.

Learned trial Court after noticing the facts, dismissed the application.

The plaintiff had only filed a suit for grant of permanent injunction restraining defendant Nos.1 and 2 from raising any construction. The plaintiff was facing threat from defendant Nos.1 and 2. During the pendency of the suit, the plaintiff filed an application claiming that now he has come to know that the owner of the adjoining property is Smt. Vandana Sharma. It is not the allegation of the plaintiff that he is facing any threat

from Vandana Sharma.

It may further be noticed that the plaintiff has already filed a separate suit for mandatory injunction directing the defendants to remove the construction raised by the defendants. In that suit, Vandana Sharma has been impleaded as party. This fact is not being disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts, revision petition is dismissed.

08.11.2017

Pawan

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No