

IN THE COURT OF SANJEEV KUMAR, MUNSIF, NARKATIAGANJ,
WEST CHAMPARAN

T.S NO- 296/2019

RASUL MIAN..... PLAINTIFF

VS.

MALIK SINGH.....DEFENDANT

DATE	ORDER	REMARKS
23.09.2024	<p style="text-align:center">Attendance filed on behalf of both parties.</p> <p>Case called out for hearing on the point of petition under order -1 Rule 10 and under section 151 of CPC.</p> <p>The present petition is filed by petitioner namely Nizamuddin Mian for adding as Defendant no-2, under order-1 Rule 10 and under section 151 of CPC, on dated 27/06/2020 along with affidavit. Rejoinder of aforesaid petition filed by Plaintiff on dated 31/03/2022 and by Defendant no-1 on dated 22/02/2024.</p> <p>Heard the ld counsel of Petitioner and Ld. Counsel for plaintiff and Defendant.</p> <p>The suit is for Declaration of title and possession over the suit land as given in schedule no-2 of the plaint having Khata no-150, Khesara-1097, Rakwa-0-3-0.</p> <p>Petitioner stated in his petition that plaintiff and defendant were not made him party in suit in order to grab the suit land and both knowingly not made him party in this suit. Petitioner also stated that plaintiff has given false Genological Table in the plaint and stated that suit land having Khata no-150 Khesara-1097 Rakwa-3 katha of land and Khata-150 of Khatiyani is in name of Vilayat Dhunia and Chhathu Dhunia and both have given equal share in that. Petitioner had purchased the land of Khata 150, Khesara-1097 Rakwa 0-4-1 (Four katha, One dhur) through sale deed no-2038 and 2037 on</p>	

IN THE COURT OF SANJEEV KUMAR, MUNSIF, NARKATIAGANJ,
WEST CHAMPARAN

T.S NO- 296/2019

RASUL MIAN..... PLAINTIFF

VS.

MALIK SINGH.....DEFENDANT

Continue 23.09.2024	<p>dated 29.01.2019 from Legal Heir of Chhathu Dhunia i.e Hamid Mian, Madhu Mian and Mustakim Mian and there after he came in peaceful possession over the suit land.</p> <p>He further stated that the suit land were never given in share of plaintiff father or their grand father and also not having possession over the suit land.</p> <p>Petitioner further stated that plaintiff Rasul Mian had purchased land of khata no-201, Khesara-1096 through a sale deed no-2540 on dated 10-3-2016 from Harinarayan singh and the suit land is in south of this purchased land and if this suit land were in name of Plaintiff then in boundary of that purchased land in south- either Nij or Rasul Mian were given but plaintiff fraudulently given name of Malik Singh and later on plaintiff filed this suit against Malik Singh (Defendant). He further stated that at time of purchase of the land plaintiff were also there and in their presence talking were took place regarding purchase of land from legal heir of Chhathu Mian and plaintiff having knowledge that petitioner had purchased the land but even they did not made him party in the suit. further he stated that he is necessary party in this suit and prayed for adding him as Defendant no-2 in the present suit.</p> <p>Plaintiff in his rejoinder dated 31/01/2022 has admitted the fact that R.S Khatiyani of Khata no-150, Khesara-1097 are in name of Vilayat Dhunia and Chhathu Dhunia S/O-Kariman Dhunia and both were given equal share in that khatiyan.</p>	
--------------------------------	---	--

IN THE COURT OF SANJEEV KUMAR, MUNSIF, NARKATIAGANJ,
WEST CHAMPARAN

T.S NO- 296/2019

RASUL MIAN..... PLAINTIFF

VS.

MALIK SINGH.....DEFENDANT

Continue 23.09.2024	<p>Plaintiff further stated that Intervenour had purchased the land from legal heir of Chhathu Dhuniya i.e Hamid Mian, Madhu Mian, Mustakim Mian through a sale Deed dated 29.01.2019 and on that basis intervenor filed this petition under order-1 rule-10 for adding him as Defendant no-2 in the present suit. It is further stated by the plaintiff that in khatiyani of khata no-150 having total Rakwa 4-9-9 and out of it in share of Vilayat Dhunia and Chhathu Dhunia both got equal share having 2-4-4 ½ each. It is further stated that chhathu dhunia were sold beyond his share to shyamlal sah having 2-7-0 through a registered sale deed dated 07-09-1933 and then after death of shyam lal sah his wife namely Sugga Kunwar was gifted to her daughter Pasupati Kunwar and her grandson about 2-19-6 ½. Through a registered gift Deed dated 25.03.1946 including chhathu dhunia shared land. In this way chhathu dhunia shared were already sold and remained nothing for their legal heir and then Registered sale deed dated 29.01.2019 is nothing but just a piece of paper and Intervenour got no any interest or right nor possession over the purchased land having khata no-150, khesara-1097, Rakwa-0-4-1. In this way intervenour got no any interest in the disputed land and his presence is not necessary in this suit land. further stated that Defendant no-1 Malik Singh was appeared in this suit on dated 09.01.2020 and thereafter till date he did not file his written statement as Defendant no-1 not having any document nor any deed so by adding intervenour in his favor has filed this petition and prayed for dismissed the petition dated 27.06.2020.</p>	
--------------------------------	--	--

IN THE COURT OF SANJEEV KUMAR, MUNSIF, NARKATIAGANJ,
WEST CHAMPARAN

T.S NO- 296/2019

RASUL MIAN..... PLAINTIFF

VS.

MALIK SINGH.....DEFENDANT

Continue 23.09.2024	<p>Defendant no-1 has also filed his rejoinder on dated 23.02.2024 and stated that intervenor petition is not maintainable and liable to be dismissed. he further stated that intervenor had purchased the land from the legal heir of chhathu Dhunia illegally and illegal sale deed have no relevancy and intervenor has filed this petition just for delayed the disposal of the suit. it is further stated that plaintiff have filed this suit for declaration of right title and possession over the suit land and suit land having khata no-150, Khesara-1097, Rakwa 0-3-0 and intervenor had purchased four Katha of land in khesara-1097 having khata no-150. He further stated that khatiyani of khata no-150 are in name of Vilayat Dhunia and Chhathu dhunia having total Rakwa 4-9-9 divided in equal share and chhathu dhunia sold 2 Bigaha 7 katha of land through registered sale deed 25-03-1946 to shyamlal Sah and after Death of Shyam Lal sah his wife Suga Kunwar has gifted 2-19-25/4 dhur of land to her daughter Pasupati Kunwar and grandson Gopal Sah on dated 07-09-1993 and in his way Chathu Dhunia had sold all his shared land and left nothing for his legal heir and further stated that purchased land of intervenor is just a peace of paper and nothing else and intervenor got no any right over purchased land of 04 katha 01 dhur of land through registered sale deed dated 29-01-2019 and prayed for dismissal of petition of the intervenor.</p> <p>The General rule in regard to impleadment of parties is that the plaintiff in a suit, being Dominus Litis, may choose the persons against whom he wishes to litigate and can not to</p>	
--------------------------------	--	--

IN THE COURT OF SANJEEV KUMAR, MUNSIF, NARKATIAGANJ,
WEST CHAMPARAN

T.S NO- 296/2019

RASUL MIAN..... PLAINTIFF

VS.

MALIK SINGH.....DEFENDANT

Continue 23.09.2024	<p>compelled to sue a person against whom he does not seek any relief. Consequently, a person who is not a party has no right to be impleaded against the wishes of plaintiff . But this General rule is subject to provision of order 1 Rule 10(2) of the CPC, which provides for impleadment of proper or Necessary parties.</p> <p>The provision of order 1 Rule-10(2) state that “court may strike out or add parties”- The court may at any stage of the proceeding, either upon, or without the application of either party, and on such terms as may appear to be the court to be just, order that the name of any party improperly joined, whether as plaintiff or defendants, be struck out, and the name of the person who ought to have been joined, whether as plaintiff or defendants, or whose presence before the court may be necessary in order to enable the court to effectually and completely to adjudicate upon and settle all the question involved in a suit, be added.</p> <p>The said provision in short make it clear that, court is given a discretion to add as a party, any person who is found to be a necessary party or proper party.</p> <p>As discussed in case law - Mumbai international airport PVT.Ltd vs. Regency Convention centra & hotel & ors AIR 2010 SCC 4222.</p> <p>A “Necessary party” is a person who ought to have been joined as a party and in whose absence no effective decree could be passed at all by the court. For being a Necessary Party, Twin Test has</p>	
--------------------------------	--	--

IN THE COURT OF SANJEEV KUMAR, MUNSIF, NARKATIAGANJ,
WEST CHAMPARAN

T.S NO- 296/2019

RASUL MIAN..... PLAINTIFF

VS.

MALIK SINGH.....DEFENDANT

Continue 23.09.2024	<p>to be satisfied – First one is that there must be a right to some relief against such party in respect of Controversy involved in the proceeding and second one is that no Effective Decree can be passed in absence of Such party.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">If a Necessary party is not impleaded, the suit itself is liable to be dismissed as held in case</p> <p style="text-align: center;">RamKumar vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & others,2022(8)supreme 684.</p> <p>A “proper party” is party who, though not a necessary party, is a person whose presence would enable the court to completely, effectively and adequately adjudicate upon all matters in dispute in the suit, though he need not be a person in favour of or against whom the decree is to be made. If a person is not found to be proper or necessary party, the court has no jurisdiction to implead him , against the wishes of plaintiff.</p> <p>Perused the petition filed by the petitioner and rejoinder of plaintiff and rejoinder filed by the Defendantno-1 from the perusal of petition, it is evident that intervenor Nijamuddin Mian had purchased the 0-4-1 (four Katha one dhur) of land having khata no-150, Khesara-1097 from Hamid Mian and Madhu Mian both S/o- Late. Makhdoom Mian and Mustakim Mian S/O- Sahdul Mian through two registered sale deed dated 29/01/2019. Suit land having khata no-150, Rakwa-1097, Rakwa-0-3-0 (Three Katha of land) and in Khatiyani total Rakwa in khesara 1097 of khata no-150 is 8 katha 3 dhur of land and plaintiff and defendant no-1 has not adduced any</p>	
--------------------------------	---	--

IN THE COURT OF SANJEEV KUMAR, MUNSIF, NARKATIAGANJ,
WEST CHAMPARAN

T.S NO- 296/2019

RASUL MIAN..... PLAINTIFF

VS.

MALIK SINGH.....DEFENDANT

Continue 23.09.2024	<p>document or sale deed by- which Chhathu Dhunia had sold his shared and after due perusal it appears that Nizamuddin Mian is the necessary party in this suit and he is person who ought to have been joined as a party and in whose absence no effective decree could be passed at all by the court.</p> <p>Intervenor had purchased the land from the legal heir of the chhathu Dhunia through two registered sale deed dated 29/01/2019 and presently suit is at stage for filling W.S of plaintiff no-1 and suit land also having khata no-150, Khesara-1097, Rakwa-0-3-0.</p> <p>After due perusal of petition and rejoinder and with reference to above discussed case law and provision this court is of view that, In the present suit Nizamuddin Mian is a necessary party as required under order 1 rule-10, Accordingly petition dated 27/06/2020 filed by Petitioner hereby Allowed. O/C directed to add Nizamuddin Mian as Defendant no- 2 in the Plaint.</p> <p>Put up on dated 29.10.2024 for further proceeding.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MUNSIF NARKATIAGANJ</p>	
--------------------------------	--	--