



CGHC010085372022

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

FA No. 46 of 2022

1. Smt. Malti Bai (Died) Through Lrs As Per Hon'ble Court Order Dated 09-09-2025.

1.1 - Omprakash Gupta S/o Late Bhola Prasad Gupta Aged About 58 Years R/o Matadewalaya Bhatapara, Tahsil Bhatapara, District - Balodabazar- Bhatapara (C.G.).

1.2 - Jaiprakash Gupta S/o Late Bhola Prasad Gupta Aged About 56 Years R/o Matadewalaya Bhatapara, Tahsil Bhatapara, District - Balodabazar- Bhatapara (C.G.).

1.3 - Vedprakash Gupta S/o Late Bhola Prasad Gupta Aged About 47 Years R/o Matadewalaya Bhatapara, Tahsil Bhatapara, District - Balodabazar- Bhatapara (C.G.).

1.4 - Urmila Gupta D/o Late Bhola Prasad Gupta Aged About 45 Years R/o Banda (U.P.)

... Appellants

versus

1. Mahabal Das S/o Shri Lakhan Das Baghel, Aged About 45 Years R/o Mata Dewalaya Ward Bhatapara, Tahsil Bhatapara, District Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara (C.G.).
2. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Collector, Baloda Bazar, District Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara (C.G.).
3. Smt. Saroj Gupta W/o Phool Chand Gupta (Died) Through Lrs As Per Hon'ble Court Order Dated 09-09-2025.

3.1 - Phool Chand Gupta S/o Bhagwan Das Gupta Aged About 56 Years R/o Chowk Bazar, Behind Manihari Street Near Baba Readymade Banda District - Banda (Uttar Pradesh) Pin -210001.

3.2 - Shivam Gupta @ Rinku Gupta S/o Phool Chand Gupta Aged About 34 Years R/o Chowk Bazar, Behind Manihari Street Near Baba Readymade Banda District - Banda (Uttar Pradesh) Pin -210001.

3.3 - Shubham Gupta S/o Phool Chand Gupta Aged About 32 Years R/o Chowk Bazar, Behind Manihari Street Near Baba Readymade Banda District - Banda (Uttar Pradesh) Pin -210001

... Respondents

Order Sheet

24/07/2026	Mr. Shobhit Koshta, Advocate for Appellant(s). Mr. Roop Ram Naik, Advocate for Respondent No.1. Mr. Narayan Prasad, Panel Lawyer for Respondent No.2/State. Heard on I.A. No.15/2026, application filed under Order 39 Rule 1 & 2 of CPC. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant(s)/plaintiffs submits that despite findings recorded by the learned trial Court that defendant No.1 is not holding any valid or legal title over the suit property, but he has created a third party interest over the suit property, for which, an application under order 1 Rule 10 of CPC for intervention/impleadment has been filed by the appellants. He further submits that the plaintiffs are in possession over the suit property by virtue of the sale deed, which was executed by Anup Kumar, Swaroop Kumar and Bharat Kumar vide registered sale deed dated 25.03.2013. He also submits that though the said seller acquired the right and title over the suit property by

Vaishali	virtue of sale deed executed by Sarajwati, widow of one of the original title holder of the suit property namely, Dau Kalyan Singh and defendant No.1 had come up by filing counter claim to disturb the possession of the appellants/plaintiffs. Opposing the submission made by the learned counsel for the appellants, Mr. Roop Ram Naik submits that the learned trial Court has dismissed the suit of the appellants on the ground that they do not have any title interest over the suit property and they are not in possession over it rather, the defendant No.1 is in possession. Be that as it may, taking into consideration the submissions made by the parties in order to protect the suit property, it is observed that '<i>status quo</i>' shall be maintained by the parties in respect of the suit property till the next date of hearing and no third party interest shall be created by any of the parties. List the matter for final hearing on 21.08.2026 at motion stage itself. Sd/- (Sachin Singh Rajput) Judge
----------	---