



232

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

**RA-CR-211-CII-2016 (O&M)
IN CR-6594-2011**

Date of Decision : 27.08.2025

Arjun Lal

... Appellant(s)

Versus

Karan Singh & Ors

... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate
for the review applicant-respondent No.5.

Mr. Sanjay Mittal, Advocate for the non-applicant/petitioner.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present review application has been filed by the review applicant-respondent No.5 for reviewing the order dated 11.02.2016.

2. On 22.01.2025 the following order was passed :

“1. The revision is against the order declining a prayer for impleadment of the vendees. There is already a decree which protects the decree-holder as tenant holding his possession leaving it to the judgment debtors to take action for possession and for eviction in accordance with law. That obligation shall be attached to every purchaser of the property as well. It was not even necessary for filing an application for impleadment under Order 1 Rule 10 of the Civil Procedure Code. A decree-holder is competent to

cite anyone who is causing disturbance claiming under the judgment debtors. The persons who sought to be impleaded were admittedly persons who sourced their right to the judgment debtors. The Court has declined impleadment. In the view that I have taken that there is not even need to implead through an application and the decree-holder can straightway include them in the petition and seek for observance of the decree, I direct the respondents, who are sought to be impleaded to comply with the decree of injunction and not to disturb his possession. The respondents will take an independent action in accordance with law through a suit or a petition under the Rent Act in the manner it is competent and till the petitioner is evicted in accordance with law, he is entitled to the benefit of the decree he has obtained against the original landlord and the successors-in-interest as well. If any disturbance to possession is experienced, the petitioner may approach the executing court for ordering of arrest in the manner contemplated under Order 21 Rule 32 of the Civil Procedure Code.

2. The impugned order is set aside the revision is allowed on the above terms.”

3. Learned counsel for the non-applicant/petitioner is not in a position to deny that an application had been filed during the pendency of the suit wherein he had prayed for restoration of possession with Police help.

4. In view thereof, sufficient grounds have been made out to review the order dated 11.02.2016 wherein a finding had been returned that the non-applicant/petitioner is in possession of the suit property. Accordingly, the present review application is allowed and the order dated 11.02.2016 is recalled. Let the main revision petition (**CR-6594-2011**) be listed for hearing on **21.01.2026**.

5. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

27.08.2025
Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO