

110

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**Civil Revision No.7043 of 2019
Date of Decision: 07.11.2019**

MUKHTIAR SINGH

.....Petitioner

Vs

RAMESH KUMAR AND OTHERS

....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Sonu Giri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

[1]. Petitioner is aggrieved of the order dated 25.09.2019 passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division) Gurugram, vide which the application under Order 1 Rule 10(2) CPC filed by the plaintiff No.2 for the impleadment of Smt. Om Wati, Smt. Bina Yadav and Bala Yadav was dismissed.

[2]. Plaintiffs filed a suit for permanent injunction and mandatory injunction against respondent No.1 on 09.04.2013. During pendency of the suit, plaintiff No.3 sold his share vide registered sale deed dated 12.08.2014 in favour of aforesaid three ladies namely Smt. Om Wati, Smt. Bina Yadav and Bala Yadav.

[3]. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

[4]. Relief for injunction is a right in *personam* and the same cannot be extended to the public at large. Impleadment of vendees of plaintiff No.3 would lead to re-opening of the case and recalling of the witnesses at this stage is not permissible. Order of status quo was passed by the trial Court on 11.04.2013 and the defendant was restrained from raising any construction. Alienation, if any was also subject to the orders of the Court. Subsequent vendees have no such threat perception as was projected by the plaintiffs, nor they have come to the Court for any such relief.

[5]. For the reasons recorded hereinabove, there is no error of jurisdiction in the order passed by the trial Court dismissing the application under Order 1 Rule 10(2) CPC. This revision petition is accordingly dismissed.

November 07, 2019

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No