

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

125

2023:PHHC:111837
CR-8016-2018
Date of decision: 25.08.2023

GIAN PARKASH

..Petitioner

Versus

OMWATI AND ORS

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Arvind Kumar Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mukesh Kumar Verma, Advocate for respondent No.18.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

1. In a suit for partition of the property, a preliminary decree was passed by the Court on first instance, which was the subject matter of challenge before the First Appellate Court. During the pendency of the first appeal, an application filed under Order I Rule 10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, by the defendant No.8 to implead Smt. Roshni Devi and Smt. Kavita, has been allowed. This revision petition has been filed to challenge its correctness.

2. The learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that more persons are required to be impleaded as parties and, therefore, the impugned order should be set aside.

3. It is evident that the learned counsel representing the petitioner does not dispute that Smt. Roshni Devi and Smt. Kavita are co-sharers in the suit property and, therefore, they are a necessary party.

4. In such circumstances, no ground to interfere is made out.

5. Dismissed accordingly.

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

August 25th, 2023

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

Ay

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No