

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

M.K.Utthan Sudhar Samiti Maryadit

Vs.

Babulalshukla & Ors.

C.A.No.4081 of 2016

(Kurian Joseph and R.Banumathi,JJ.,)

18.04.2016

JUDGMENT

Kurian Joseph, J.

SLP(Civil)No.28479 of 2010

1. Leave granted.
 2. In the nature of the order we propose to pass, it is not necessary to go into the various factual aspects. The limited grievance of the appellant is that though the High Court initially had taken a view, while issuing notice, that the appellant will be heard at the time of disposal of the Civil Revision Petition, but finally, by the impugned order, its application for intervention was rejected.
 3. Having heard the learned counsel on both the sides, we are of the view that in the interest of justice, the intervention application of the appellant should be allowed and the appellant should also be permitted to participate in the proceedings.
- Ordered accordingly.
4. The appellant shall also be permitted to participate in the Civil Revision Petition No. 414 of 2004 pending before the High Court. We request the High Court to expedite the disposal of the petition.
 5. In view of the above, the appeal is disposed of with no order as to costs.