



122

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

CR-2645-2025

Date of decision: 20.05.2025

Sushma Devi and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Saroj Goel and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Vijay Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, Advocate for respondent No.1
(Through Video Conferencing)

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a revision petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 03.02.2025 (Annexure P-1) vide which the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Narnaul has dismissed the application of the petitioners under Order 1 Rule 10 and Order 22 Rule 10 CPC.

2. On 01.05.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Present:- Mr. Vijay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Inter alia, contends that in the present case, the suit was filed on 29.03.2023 and the original defendants had sold the part of the suit land to the petitioners on 07.04.2023 and thus, the petitioners are lis pendens purchasers. It is submitted that since the substantial rights had been transferred to the petitioners, thus, they at least have a right to participate in the proceedings as per the provisions of Order 22 Rule 10 CPC read with Section 151 CPC. It is further submitted that in case the petitioners are permitted to participate in the proceedings, they would not raise any independent plea and agitate only those aspects which can be agitated by the original defendants. It is stated that the case is now fixed for the evidence of the plaintiff on 07.07.2025 and till date no



plaintiff's evidence has been led and thus, the case is at initial stage.

Notice of motion be issued to respondent No.1 only for 20.05.2025.

Notice re: stay as well.

Liberty is granted to the petitioners to serve respondent No.1 through dasti process as well as through the counsel appearing before the trial Court.

To be taken up in the urgent list.

May 01, 2025”

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 has submitted that in case the petitioners abide by the undertaking given before this Court that the petitioners would not raise any independent plea and would agitate only those aspects which can be agitated by the original defendants and further would not delay the proceedings unnecessarily then the petitioners could be permitted to be impleaded under Order 22 Rule 10 CPC read with Section 151 CPC.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in view of the objection raised by learned counsel for respondent No.1, the petitioners would not unnecessarily delay the proceedings.

5. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances and fair stand taken by learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned counsel for respondent No.1, the present revision petition is partly allowed and the impugned order dated 03.02.2025 is modified to the extent that the petitioners are given rights to participate in the proceedings in accordance with Order 22 Rule 10 CPC read with Section 151 CPC.

20.05.2025

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No