

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT

C.R.P.No.5017 OF 2011

ORDER:

Heard Mr.S.Nyaya Murthy for petitioner and Mr.S.R.Mahajir for respondent No.1.

Plaintiff in O.S.No.2443 of 2010 in the Court of the XIX Junior Civil Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad is the revision petitioner. The revision petitioner filed I.A.No.963 of 2011 under Order I Rule 10 of CPC seeking impleadment of proposed respondents i.e., Government of Andhra Pradesh, represented by Collector, Hyderabad and Tahsildar, Saidabad, Hyderabad as defendants Nos.3 and 4.

The averments, in brief, for impleading proposed respondents Nos.3 and 4 as defendant Nos.3 and 4 are that since GHMC was already impleaded on the statement of defendant No.1, it is necessary to implead defendant Nos.3 and 4. The 1st respondent/defendant No.1 opposed the prayer of revision petitioner stating that there is no cause of action and in the absence of any pleading, the application is not maintainable.

The learned trial Judge rejected the prayer of petitioner on the ground that the petitioner/plaintiff failed to establish any cause of action against the proposed respondents. Hence, the revision.

I have perused the record. The trial Court has rightly dismissed the application filed by the petitioner. This Court is in agreement with the reasons recorded by the trial Court. No ground warranting interference under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is made out.

Revision fails and is, accordingly, dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, stands closed.

S.V.BHATT, J

17th August, 2018
Lrkm