

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

Civil Revision No.3572 of 2017
Date of decision: May 17, 2017

Parminder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Kiran Bhanot

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Rai, Advocate for the petitioner.

Rajan Gupta, J.

Present revision petition is directed against the order dated 3.5.2017, passed by the trial court, whereby application filed by the petitioner under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC has been dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has assailed the order. According to him, since ICICI Bank ARCIL Arms have declared that they would take possession of the property in question, therefore, they are necessary parties to the suit.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and given careful thought to the facts of the case.

It appears, petitioner/plaintiff filed a suit for permanent injunction against the landlady i.e. respondent/defendant for restraining the defendant from interfering into his possession over the shop in question on the ground that plaintiff is tenant over the property.

Defendant appeared and filed written statement. During pendency of

proceedings, plaintiff filed instant application with a prayer to implead ICICI Bank and ARCIL Arms as party on the ground that they have tried to take possession of the property from the plaintiff. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the trial court dismissed the application. I find no infirmity with the order passed. I am of the considered view that the court below has not committed any error in dismissing the application filed by the petitioner. There is, thus, no scope for interference in revisional jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

May 17, 2017
'Rajpal'

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:

Yes / No