

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

111

**CR-1218-2020
Date of Order: 18.04.2022**

JAI NARAIN

..Petitioner

Versus

PARVESH AND OTHERS

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

While assailing the correctness of interlocutory order dated 28.01.2020, the plaintiff has filed the present revision petition. The learned trial Court while allowing the application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC has impleaded the Gram Panchayat as a defendant in a suit for grant of decree of permanent injunction.

It has been found that as per the revenue record, the property is recorded to be owned by *Guga Mari*. The Court in such situation, particularly when such religious place is looked after by the Gram Panchayat ordered its impleadment.

This Bench has heard the learned counsel representing the petitioner and with his able assistance perused the paperbook.

The learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that the petitioner being *dominus litis*, is entitled to protect his possession. He submits that the petitioner does not have any apprehension from the Gram Panchayat or its office bearers.

While deciding a suit for grant of decree of permanent injunction, the Court is required to see as to whether proper parties have been impleaded by the plaintiff or not. It is the case of the petitioner that he

being the priest is managing the affairs of the *Guga Mari*. Such being the position, the Court has only ordered impleadment of the Gram Panchayat in order to do substantive justice.

Hence, no ground to interfere is made out.

Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

April 18th, 2022

Ay

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>