



126

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

CR-6480-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 15.09.2025

VIJAY GUPTA

.... Petitioner

VERSUS

NARENDER SINGH AND ORS

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India challenging the order dated 29.04.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panipat whereby the application filed by the petitioner herein under Order I Rule 10 CPC read with Section 151 CPC for impleading as a defendant, being a necessary party, was dismissed.

2. Brief facts relevant to the present *lis* are that the plaintiff-respondent No.1 herein filed a suit for permanent injunction restraining the defendants (respondents No.2 to 8 herein) from interfering in the peaceful possession of the plaintiff-respondent No.1 and other co-sharers and also from forcibly and illegally dispossessing the plaintiff-respondent No.1 from the suit property as detailed in the plaint and also for mandatory injunction. The said property is situated in Khewat No.36//34 and Khewat No.37//35. The petitioner herein filed an application under Order I Rule 10 CPC read with

Section 151 CPC (Annexure P-3) on the ground that he had purchased the suit land vide sale deed dated 06.06.2024 and as such he was a necessary party. Reply was filed to the said application. Vide the impugned order dated 29.04.2025 the application was dismissed. Aggrieved by the same the present revision petition has been filed by the petitioner herein.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that vide sale deed dated 06.06.2024 the petitioner herein has purchased the property in Khewat No.50 and has been given symbolic possession of the same. Learned counsel would further contend that though the property of the plaintiff-respondent No.1 is situated in Khewat No.36//34 and Khewat No.37//35, however, the same is adjoining the property of the petitioner and any injunction granted would amount to permitting the plaintiff-respondent No.1 to encroach upon the petitioner's land.

4. Heard.

5. In the present case in the entire plaint there is no relief claimed qua the petitioner herein. The plaintiff is *dominus litis* and he cannot be compelled to litigate against someone qua whom no relief has been claimed. Admittedly, the petitioner herein has purchased the property in Khewat No.50 and the suit is qua Khewat No.36//34 and Khewat No.37//35. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to convince this Court that the petitioner has any right, title or interest in the suit land or that the petitioner would be affected in any manner. Therefore, not being a necessary or proper party, no fault can be found with the impugned order. No other point has been argued.

6. In view of the above, I do not find any merit in the present revision petition and the same is accordingly dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

7. Needless to say, any observations made herein shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

15.09.2025

Aman Jain

(ALKA SARIN)

JUDGE

*NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: Yes/No*