

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

**CR No.1059 of 2024**

**Date of Decision: 21.02.2024**

Vikram Singh @ Vikram

...Revisionist-Petitioner

Versus

Vinod Kumar and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present:- Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate  
for the revisionist-petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (Oral)**

By filing the instant revision-petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner-plaintiff (here-in-after to be referred as 'the plaintiff') has laid challenge to the order (Annexure P-4) as passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Karnal (for short 'the trial Court') on 31.01.2024 in *Civil Suit No.2960 of 2018* titled as '*Vikram vs Vinod Kumar*', whereby the application (Annexure P-2), moved by respondent No.2-applicant (here-in-after to be referred as 'the applicant') under Order 1 Rule 10 read with Section 151 CPC for being impleaded as defendant No.2 in the above-said Suit, has been allowed.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner-plaintiff in the present revision-petition, at the preliminary stage and have also gone through the file carefully.

3. Learned counsel for the plaintiff contends that the afore-referred Civil Suit has been filed by the plaintiff against respondent No.1-defendant for seeking a decree for permanent injunction in respect of the suit property

and the applicant has no concern with the same nor the plaintiff wants to seek any relief against her but vide the impugned order, the trial Court has wrongly allowed the above-mentioned application and it being so, the said order is not legally sustainable and deserves to be set-aside.

4. However, the afore-raised contentions do not cut much ice with this Court because a perusal of the plaint (Annexure P-1) reveals that in Para No.1 therein, the plaintiff has claimed himself to be the owner in possession of the suit property whereas in Para No.3 of her application (Annexure P-2), the applicant has also averred that she is the owner of the above-said property by virtue of the sale-deed dated 07.07.2017 and that initially, the plaintiff was in possession over this property as a licensee but later-on, when she requested him to vacate the same, he refused to do so. In these circumstances, it is quite explicit that the relief of permanent injunction, as sought by the plaintiff on the basis of his ownership, would certainly require the consideration of the rival claim of the applicant in respect of the same property, meaning thereby that she is a necessary party to the afore-referred Civil Suit and thus, the trial Court has rightly allowed her to be impleaded as defendant No.2 therein.

5. As a sequel to the fore-going discussion, it follows that the impugned order does not suffer from any illegality, irregularity, infirmity or perversity so as to call for any interference by this Court. Resultantly, the revision-petition in hand, being *sans* any merit, stands dismissed.

21.02.2024  
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)  
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned:* Yes  
*Whether Reportable:* No