

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

CRP No.32 of 2025

1. Sri Ram Chandra Noatia, (45 years), S/o Biswa Kumar Noatia, resident of Vill- Anandapur (Mohanbhog), P.S. Melaghar, District- Sepahijala Tripura.
2. Sri Sona Manik Noatia, (50 years), S/o Biswa Kumar Noatia, resident of Vill- Anandapur (Mohanbhog), P.S. Melaghar, District- Sepahijala Tripura.
3. Sri Jayanta Debbarma, (36 years) S/o Chinta Mani Debbarma, resident of Anandapur (Mohanbhog), P.S. Melaghar, District- Sepahijala Tripura.
4. Sri Rajkumar Debbarma, (35 years) S/o Subarna Debbarma, resident of Anandapur (Mohanbhog), P.S. Melaghar, District- Sepahijala Tripura.
5. Sri Nabadwip Debbarma, (50 years), S/o Late Bijoy Debbarma, resident of Anandapur (Mohanbhog), P.S. Melaghar, District- Sepahijala Tripura.

Versus

Santi Kali Mission School, Represented by its Secretary, S.K.M. Mohanbhog Branch, Anil Debbarma, S/o Late Braja Gopal Debbarma, of Mohanbhog, P.S. Melaghar, District- Sepahijala Tripura.

.....Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Pradip Chakraborty, Advocate,
Ms. Sukriti Debnath, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Herojit Debbarma, Advocate.

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO

Order

29/08/2025

Heard counsel for the petitioners and counsel for respondent.

2. In this revision, petitioners/defendants No.1 to 5 have challenged a common order dated 05.12.2024 of the Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Court No.1, Sonamura, Sepahijala in two applications – one filed under Order I Rule 10(2) CPC to add certain parties as defendants, and another application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC for amendment of the written statement.

3. Firstly there ought to be two revisions challenging the orders passed in each of these applications, even if a common order is passed.

4. Secondly the respondent is the *dominus litis*, and he has filed a suit for a perpetual injunction against the petitioners asserting his possession to the plaint schedule property, which is being disputed by the petitioners.

5. The respondent cannot be compelled to litigate against a party like the proposed parties, who are sought to be impleaded at the behest of the petitioners/defendants, raising issues of title to the property, which, normally in a suit for perpetual injunction based on possession, ought not to be gone into.

6. I, therefore, do not find any reason to interfere with the order passed by the Court below.

7. Accordingly, the revision fails, and is dismissed.

(M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO, CJ)

