



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(202)

CR No.3917 of 2023

Date of Decision: 04.03.2025

M/s Golden Infrastructure Private Limited and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Gurcharan Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Nimish Gautam, Advocate for
Mr. Dheeraj Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jaswinder Singh Randhawa, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

The present revision petition is directed against the order dated 19.05.2023 (Annexure P-10) passed by the Court of learned Additional District Judge, SAS Nagar, Mohali vide which the operation of the judgment and decree dated 26.04.2018 was stayed subject to deposit of ₹50,00,000/- by the petitioners-defendants in the shape of a bank guarantee.

2. On 17.08.2023, the following order was passed by a Coordinate Bench:-

“The present petition has been filed by the petitioner being aggrieved of the order dated 19.05.2023 (Annexure P-10) passed by the Court of Additional District Judge, SAS Nagar (Mohali) wherein the stay application moved by the petitioner to stay the operation of the judgment dated 26.04.2018 passed by the learned trial Court, which is under challenge before the said Court, has been stayed subject to deposit of Rs. 50,00,000/- in the shape of bank guarantee by the next date of hearing.

Notice to respondent No. 1 only be issued for 15.02.2024.

In the meantime the operation of the impugned order as well as judgment and decree dated 26.04.2018 passed by the trial Court is hereby stayed till the next date of hearing subject to deposit of Rs. 20,00,000/- in the shape of bank guarantee and furnishing of security with regard to the balance amount to the satisfaction of the Court of Additional District Judge, SAS Nagar (Mohali) by the petitioner.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in compliance of the said order, bank guarantee of ₹20,00,000/- has been furnished and as regards the remaining decretal amount, security has been furnished before the First Appellate Court.

4. Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that for the present, neither side has any grievance and they will argue the appeal on its own merits. They submit that under the circumstances, the present revision petition has been rendered infructuous.

5. In view of the above, the present revision petition is disposed of having been rendered infructuous.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE**

March 04 2025

Rekha

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