

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.6261 of 2019

Date of Decision: 15.10.2019

Narain Dass

..Appellant

Vs.

Amarnath and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS.JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr.H.S.Oberoi, Advocate for the petitioner.

RITU BAHRI, J.

The petitioner has come up in revision against the order dated 22.8.2019 whereby an application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC for impleading State Bank of India, Branch RASMECCC, Urban Estate Phase III, Patiala through its Manager as party in the present suit has been allowed.

Counsel for the appellant states that a separate suit has been filed by the plaintiffs challenging the auction conducted by the Bank i.e. Annexure P-8 and even the present suit filed by the plaintiff is based upon the family settlement dated 10.04.2011. In the family settlement the disputed property was mortgaged by the bank and now it has been sold by way of auction and the auction proceedings are already challenged by the plaintiffs. A perusal of the impugned order shows that in the present suit, the subsequent purchaser of the property i.e. Deepali has already been made a party vide order dated 19.05.2017. Keeping in view that property has been

the Bank and in this background the application has been rightly allowed.

No case is made out to interfere in the impugned award. Dismissed.

15.10.2019

Meenu

**(Ritu Bahri)
Judge**

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