

248

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CR No. 6684 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.03.2019

Satwinder Singh

-Petitioner

Vs

Baldev Singh and others

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Vikas Cuccria, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Birinder Singh Khehar, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Notice of motion was issued on 03.10.2018 by
passing the following order:-

*“The only grievance of the petitioner is that
the third party objections filed by the petitioner
along with Pritpal Singh and Ashpreet Singh
were dismissed by the executing Court vide
order dated 23.12.2014. An appeal was
preferred before the Additional District Judge,
Ludhiana and the same was also dismissed.
Civil Revision was preferred which was partly
allowed to the extent of house in question. Qua*

remaining property, warrants of possession were issued with the police help. Learned counsel contends that with the help of police even possession of the house is sought to be taken.

Notice of motion for 21.01.2019.

In the meanwhile, status quo only qua house in question be maintained as per order dated 17.12.2015 passed by the Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Payal.”

It appears from the record that in Civil Revision No.2605 of 2015 arising out of order dated 23.12.2014 passed by Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Payal, *status quo* regarding possession over the house in question was granted on 21.07.2015.

Order dated 17.12.2015 was passed by Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Payal on the basis of aforesaid interim order dated 21.07.2015 and warrants of possession were issued except the house in question.

The rigor of said order was totally dependent upon the fate of Civil Revision No.2605 of 2015 which was ultimately dismissed by the High Court on 21.12.2015 with costs of Rs.10,000/-.

With the dismissal of Civil Revision No.2605 of 2015, currency of order dated 17.12.2015 would automatically come to an end. The immunity from delivery of possession qua the house in question would not be available to the petitioner anymore on the basis of interim order dated 21.12.2015 which ultimately merged into final order of dismissal of Civil Revision No.2605 of 2015.

In view of aforesaid position, there is no scope to interfere in this revision petition.

This revision petition is accordingly, dismissed.

06.03.2019
Jyoti Yadav

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No