

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

127

CR-2419-2020

Date of decision: 24.11.2022

PREM LATA

..Petitioner

Versus

PINKY AND ORS.

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Abhinav Sood, Advocate
for Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.1 and 2.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

The defendants No.1 and 2 in a suit for grant of decree of permanent injunction made a statement that they do not want to purchase the land under the alleged passage and they do not wish to dispossess the plaintiff except in due course of law. On the basis of the aforesaid statement, defendants No.1 and 2 were deleted from the array of the parties. This revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has been filed challenging the correctness of the aforesaid order. In the revision petition it is asserted that the respondents are a necessary party.

Once defendant No.1 and 2 have undertaken not to dispossess the plaintiff except in the due course of law and they do not want to purchase the plot underneath the passage, no useful purpose shall be served by keeping the litigation pending against defendant No.1 and 2.

Hence, no ground to interfere is made out.

Dismissed.

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

November 24th, 2022

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

Ay

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No