## DECRETAL ORDER

THE MIL MOURT OF THE PRIJUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE, HYD.WEST & SOUTH, R.P. DIST.
AT SAROORNAGAR, HYDERABAD.

PRESENT: KUH.Y. SUJAHA KUMMRI, F. SC., B.L., Prl. Junior Civil Judge, Hyd. West & South, R.R. Dist.

Dated this the 2nd day of September, 1998.

I.A.1853/97 in' o.s. 242/93

## DEPAREN:

Hi. Huralidhar Rao, S/o. late H.V. Harsmith, Age: 41 Yrs., Occ: Business, R/o.6-1-126, Padmarao Magar, Secunderal ad.

. PETITIONER/ PLAINTIFF

AND

- 1. Gurudev Siddapeet, Rep.by its Executive Frustee Hr.Satish Modi, S/o.Manilal Modi, Age: 14 Yrs., R/o.Saritha Apartments, Road Ho.4, Banjara Hills, Hyd.
- 2. Satish Modi, S/o.Manilal Modi, Age: 54 Yrs., Occ: Executive Trustee of Gurudev Siddageet, E/o.5-4-187/3 and 3, II Floor, Sonam Mansion, H.G.Raod, Secunderabad.
- .. RESPONDENTS/ DEFENDANTS 1 & 2
- 3. P. Sudershan, S/o.P.Pentalah, Age: 44 Yrs., Dec: Business, R/o.1-4-485, Mushemmahad, Hyd.
- .. Proposed party RESPONDENT/ DEFE DANT NO.3

CLAIM: Petition U/0.1 rule 10 to impleed the proposed party as defendant No.3 in the main suit.

Petition presented on 3.10 97, petition numbered in 27.11.97.

This petition coming on this day before me for final disposal in the presence of Sri V.Narender Na h, Advocate for potitioner/plaintiff and of Sri Bal Gopal, Advocate for respondents/detendants 1 and 2 and of Sri E.V.S.Murthy, Advocate for respondent No.3 as proposed defendant No.3 the Court doth order and decree as follows:

1. That the petition of the petition be an the same is hereby

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on this the and day of September, 1998.

Pri.Junior Civil Judge
Hyd. West & South.

FOR DEFENDANT

Stamp on Plaint

Stamp on Vakalat

Camp on process

20/
Ivocate fee F.C. and N.C. not filed by both parties.

Pri.Junior Civil Judge
Hyd. West & South.

Pri.Junior Civil Judge
Hyd. West & South.

Pri.Junior Civil Judge
Hyd. West & South.

Pri.Junior Civil Judge

Hyd. West & South.

Pri.Junior Civil Judge

Pri.Junior Civil Judge

Pri.Junior Civil Judge

Hyd. West & South.

Pri.Junior Civil Judge

Hyd

THE COURT OF THE PRL.JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE, HYD.WEST & SOUTH, R.R. DIST.

AT SAROORNAGAR, HYDERABAD.

PRESENT: KUM.Y.SUJANA KUMARI, B.SC., B.L.,
Prl.Junior Civil Judge,
Hyd.West & South, R.R.Dist.

Dated this the 2nd day of September, 1998.

in 0.s. 242/93

## BETWEEN:

M.Muralidhar Rao, S/o.late M.V.Narsaiah, Age: 41 Yrs., Occ: Business, R/o.6-1-126, Padmarao Nagar, secunderabadi

Petitioner/ Plaintiff

## and

- 1. Gurude Siddapeet Rep.by ts Executive Trustee Hr. Satish Modi, S/o. Manilal Modi, Age: 54 Yrs., R/o. Saritha Apartments, Road No. 4, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad.
- 2. Satish Hodi, S/o.Manilal Modi, Age: 54 Yrs., Occ: Executive Trustee of Gurudev Siddapeet, R/o.5-4-187/3 and 4, 2nd floor, Soham Mansion, M.G.Road, Secunderabad,

Respondents/ Defendants 1&2

3. P.Sudershan, S/o.P.Pentaiah, Age:44 Yrs., Occ:Business, R/o.1-4-485, Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

Proposed party Respondent/Defendary No.3.

This petition is coming on 28.8.98 before me for final disposal in the presence of Sri V.Narender Nath, Advocate for petitioner/plaintiff and of Sri C.Balgopal Advocate for Respondents/defendants 1 and 2 and of Sri E.V.S.Murthy, Advocate for respondent No.3 as proposed defendant No.3 and the matter having stoodover for consideration till this day: this Court delivered the following:

O\_R\_D\_E\_R

This petition is filed by the plaintiff in the suit #/o

1 rule 10 CPC to impleaded third respondent as third defendant in the
suit. This suit is filed for perpetual injunction restraining the
respondents from inteffering with the petitioners possession of the
suit schedule property measuring yards in Plot No.8/11 in :y.No.37

of Degumpet stating that the re pondents/defendants 1 and 2 attempted
to disposates the 1 stitioner on 12.10.93. In this petition the
petitioner contends that the third respondent who executed sale
deed in favour of the petitioner's vendor as GPA holder of Varikoppula
Ramajah, entered into an agreement Dt:7.3.96 with respondents 1 and 2
and delivered all the plots in Sy.No.37 including the suit schedule
of by accepting No.35 lakhs, without any manner of right and so

contd . ? .

The is just and necessary to impleaded the third respondent as defendant to the suit. The contention of the proposed defendant/third respondent is that he is the GPA holder of Varikoppula Ramaiah as contended by the petitioner, that he did not execute any sale deed as GPA holder of Varikoppula Romaiah in 1986 as Ramaiah died in the year 1983 itself, which he did not execute any sale deed in favour of the petitioner's vendor of PA holder of Ramazak, that the agreement Dt:7.3.96 was entered into between this respondent and respondents 1 and 2 for settlement of long standing disputes and he never delivered anybodies land to the respondents 1 and 2, that he has nothing to do with the suit and so he is not a necessary party.

The respondents 1 and 2 also contended that respondent.

The 3 is not a necessary party to the suit as there is not cause of action against him. The petitioner did not file the agreement said to have been entered into between respondents 1 and 2 and the third respondent in support of his contention that the suit schedule property was delivered under it to respondents 1 and 2 pending the suit. There is nothing to show the action of the third respondent with the suit schedule property. There is now cause of action against third respondent. This suit is only for simple injunction and is not comprehensive suit regarding the rights in the suit schedule property. When there is no cause of action against third respondent and when the interest of the respondent No.3 in the suit schedule property is not shown) feel that impleading third respondent as defe dant in the suit is not necessary and proper for adjudication of the issue in the suit.

Hence this petition is dismissed with costs.

