

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 303 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of decision : 17.1.2019

...

Anoop Singh and others

.....Petitioners

vs.

Bhuru Ram and others

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice H. S. Madaan

Present: Mr. Vijay Singh Kajla, Advocate the petitioner.

...

H. S. Madaan, J. (Oral)

Plaintiffs Anoop Singh, Rajbir and Jagbir – all sons of Dhup Singh, as well as, Smt. Santosh- widow, Suman, Manju – daughters, Ravinder and Subhash sons of Krishan, had filed a suit for declaration and possession against Bhuru Ram. Said civil suit No. 20-C was decreed by Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Hisar, vide judgment and decree dated 2.3.2017. Aggrieved by the said judgment and decree, defendant Bhuru Ram had filed an appeal before the Court of District Judge, Hisar, which was assigned to Additional District Judge, Hisar. In the memo of parties, name of Smt. Santosh plaintiff No.4 could not be reflected as a respondent. Realising that

error, the defendant-appellant had moved an application for impleading Smt. Santosh, as respondent No.7A. The said application was accepted by learned Additional District Judge, Hisar, vide order dated 20.12.2018, observing that the omission to implead Smt. Santosh was only a typographical and clerical error.

I have gone through the said order and I do not find any illegality or infirmity therewith, which might have called for interference by this Court, while exercising the revisional jurisdiction. There is no merit in the revision petition and the same stands dismissed.

17.1.2019
chugh

(H.S. Madaan)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes / No
-----------------------------	----------

Whether reportable	Yes / No
--------------------	----------