

CR-3796-2025 (O&M)
CR-3797-2025 (O&M)

1

2025:PHHC:087756



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

118

CR-3796-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.07.2025

A.B SUGARS LTD.

...Petitioner

Versus

VINOD KUMAR SEKHRI AND ANOTHER ...Respondents

CR-3797-2025 (O&M)

A.B SUGARS LTD.

...Petitioner

Versus

RAVI PAL SEKHRI AND ANOTHER ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present: Mr. Gurmeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in both petitions.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN , J.

1. By this common order, this Court shall decide the above-mentioned two civil revision petitions.
2. Present petitions have been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India impugning the order dated 31.05.2025 (Annexure P-13) passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Dasuya, Hoshiarpur dismissing the objection petition filed on behalf of the petitioner(s) in execution petitions



bearing No.322/2024 and 64/2024, whereby the warrants of possession for delivery of trucks bearing No.PCJ-4922 and PUQ-3598 have been issued.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that the suit filed on behalf of the respondent No.1-plaintiff (in both petitions) against the Punjab State Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. (for short *PSIDC Ltd.*) praying for decree of declaration that PSIDC Ltd. had no right to seize the vehicle and the vehicle belonged to respondent No.1-plaintiff (in both petitions) was decreed. The appeal filed impugning the aforesaid judgment and decree was dismissed and ultimately RSA filed by respondent No.2 was also dismissed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 08.07.2022 (Annexure P-5). Though the review application filed by respondent No.1 is pending before this Court, however, the Executing Court has dismissed the objections filed on behalf of the petitioner(s) and ordered for warrant of possession of the trucks in question.

4. It is very fairly contended that the trucks in question were taken in auction by the petitioner(s) from PSIDC Ltd. but due to lapse of more than 25 years, the trucks became obsolete and were sold to scrap dealers. However, petitioner(s) are ready to compensate by making payment of costs/price of the said trucks to respondent No.1 (Vinod Kumar Sekhri and Ravi Pal Sekhri in both petitions).

5. In view of the innocuous prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s), issuance of notice to the respondents is dispensed with.

6. I have considered the aforesaid submissions and perused the paper-book.

7. Though there is no merit in the present petitions, however, in view of



a limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s), the present petitions stand dismissed. However, the Executing Court shall consider the request of the petitioner(s) for making the payment instead of delivery of actual possession of the trucks.

8. Liberty is granted to the respondents to file an application for recalling of this order, if so advised, since the order is being passed in their absence.

9. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN)
JUDGE

17.07.2025
P.Bhatt

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