



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

\*\*\*\*

116

CR-3403-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:10.09.2025

Alka Devi and Another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Bakshish Singh and Others

.....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Jastaran Chhatwal, Advocate  
for the petitioners.  
(through Video Conferencing).

\*\*\*\*

**DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)**

**CM-17066-CII-2025:**

This is an application under Section 151 CPC moved by the petitioners to place on record Annexure P-4.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, same is allowed.

Annexure P-4 is taken on record.

**Main case.:**

Suit for specific performance filed by Harjit Singh (*respondent No.2 herein*) was decreed on 27.08.2018 by learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Abohar against four defendants Bakshish Singh etc. Appeal filed by one of the defendant Bakshish Singh is pending before learned Additional District Judge, Fazilka.

The petitioners herein namely Alka Devi and Sarita Devi purchased the property in dispute on 31.10.2019 i.e. after the decision by the trial Court and during pendency of the appeal and then they moved an



**CR-3403-2025 (O&M)**

**-2-**

application under Order I Rule 10 CPC to implead them as a party to the appeal. That application has been rejected by learned Additional District Judge, Fazilka by way of impugned order dated 26.11.2024, which has been assailed by way of the present revision.

The only submission made by counsel for the petitioners is that in case petitioners are not impleaded as a party, they will suffer irreparable loss, as they have purchased the suit property for a valuable consideration.

This Court does not find any merit in the contention.

Concededly the sale deed in favour of the petitioners has been executed after the decision by the trial Court and during the pendency of the appeal. Said sale deed is clearly hit by Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act. Petitioners will be bound by the result of litigation as they have simply stepped into the shoes of their vendor. As rightly observed by learned Additional District Judge, no independent rights have accrued to the petitioners, so as to implead them as a party to the appeal merely because they have purchased the property during pendency of the appeal.

As such, this Court does not find any merit in this petition in the absence of any illegality of perversity.

Dismissed.

**(DEEPAK GUPTA)**  
**JUDGE**

**September 10, 2025**

Neetika Tuteja

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No