



CR-5205-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-5205-2024

Date of decision : 11.09.2024

Jaipuria Sunrise Greens Apartment Owners Welfare Association

... Petitioner

Versus

Umesh Verma and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Arjun Shukla, Advocate and
Ms.Vanshika Grover, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Rajnikant Upadhyay, Advocate for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the impugned order dated 06.08.2024 passed by the Civil Judge (Jr.Div.), Derabassi (Annexure P-1) in case bearing CIS no.CS/744/2024 titled as “Jaipuria Sunrise Greens Apartment Owners Welfare Association vs. Umesh Verma & others” whereby the Court has refused to grant ad-interim injunction.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for the respondents have jointly submitted that in the present case, the written statement dated 14.08.2024 has already been filed by the respondents-defendants no.1 to 6 and further submitted that the petitioner would file a replication on or before 19.09.2024, with an advance copy to



CR-5205-2024

2

learned counsel for the respondents-defendants no.1 to 6 in the trial Court and has stated that in the said circumstances, the trial Court be requested to decide the application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC, as expeditiously as possible and in a time bound manner.

3. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances and the joint prayer made by learned counsel for the parties, the present petition is disposed of with the following observations:-

- i) It would be open to the petitioner to file replication on or before 19.09.2024, with an advance copy to the counsel for the respondents-defendants in the trial Court.
- ii) The trial Court is requested to decide the application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 20 days from 19.09.2024.
- iii) The counsel appearing for the parties have undertaken that the counsel appearing before the trial Court would not seek any adjournment and would argue the same on the date given by the trial Court on 19.09.2024.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the application and both the parties would raise all pleas, in accordance with law, and the same would be considered by the trial Court while passing the order on the application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

September 11, 2024.
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No