

W.M.P.No.15811 of 2019

in

W.P.No.24817 of 2005

K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.,

This application has been filed to implead the petitioner/proposed respondent as a third respondent in the above writ petition.

2. The Government had assigned lands in favour of the writ petitioner/first respondent herein in the year 1920 and the assignment was cancelled due to violation of the assignment conditions.

3. The petitioner/proposed respondent would state that in pursuance of the lease agreement dated 23.3.1998 with the writ petitioner, he has spent Rs.2 crores for construction of the building and they have interest in the outcome of the writ petition.

4. Per contra the learned counsel for the writ petitioner/first respondent stoutly resisted to allow the application by contending that the impleading petitioner is neither necessary nor a proper party in the writ petition, who is claiming as a tenant in the first respondent.

K.KALYANASUNDARAM. J.,

ms

5. However, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner/proposed respondent is a necessary party to be impleaded in the writ petition. Accordingly, the application is allowed.

6. Registry is directed to print the name of the Advocate Commissioner in the cause list and post the writ petition after two weeks.

19.08.2019

ms

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY

W.M.P.No.15811 of 2019
in
W.P.No.24817 of 2005