

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR 2890-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.03.2018

Bijender

.....Petitioner

versus

Gram Panchayat Kheri Bura and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldeep Singh

Present: Mr.Ajay Vijarana, Advocate for
Mr.Vikrant Rana, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr.H.N.Mehtani, Advocate for
Mr.Parvesh Kumar Banwail, Advocate
for respondent nos.4 and 5

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldeep Singh, J. (Oral)

Impugned in the present revision petition is order dated 1.4.2017 (Annexure P4), passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Charkhi Dadri, vide which, application filed by Satya Kumar under Order I Rule 10 CPC 1908 to be impleaded as defendant was allowed.

Heard.

Impugned order perused.

The suit was filed by Bijender present petitioner against Gram Panchayat Kheri Bura and State of Haryana. Present applicant Satya Kumar stated that there is a collusion between the plaintiff and the Gram Panchayat and that the passage to the house of the applicant will become narrow if the suit is decreed. Therefore, he will be adversely affected by judgment and decree.

Trial Court took the view that no prejudice will be caused to the plaintiff and that the presence of the defendant applicant Satya Kumar is necessary.

It being so, no fault can be found with the order passed by the trial Court, if it decides to hear Satya Kumar also before passing of the decree. No ground is made out to interfere in the impugned order.

Resultantly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

Since the main case has been dismissed, therefore, the pending CM, if any, also stands disposed of.

19.03.2018
gk

(Kuldip Singh)
Judge

Whether speaking/ reasoned:	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No