

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

2025.PHHC.113140



DATE OF DECISION : 26.08.2025

- 1. CR-5591-2025 (O&M)**
ANMOL SINGH ... PETITIONER
V/S
SHINGARA SINGH AND OTHERS ... RESPONDENTS
- 2. CR-5601-2025 (O&M)**
ANMOL SINGH ... PETITIONER
V/S
SHINGARA SINGH AND OTHERS ... RESPONDENTS
- 3. CR-5611-2025 (O&M)**
ANMOL SINGH ... PETITIONER
V/S
SHINGARA SINGH AND OTHERS ... RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. G.S.Sirphikhi, Advocate for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Harminder Singh, Advocate for respondent No.1.

* * *

PARMOD GOYAL, J. (ORAL)

Present revision petitions have been preferred by petitioner Anmol Singh who is aggrieved by the impugned order dated 11.07.2025 (Annexure P-8) passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Batala vide which applications by applicant under Section 151 CPC for consolidation of 3 suits; Civil Suit No. 343 of 2020 titled as Shingara Singh Vs. Kulbir Singh and others, Civil Suit No. 409 of 2020 Shingara Singh Vs. Paramjit Kaur and others and Civil Suit No. 539 of 2020 Anmol Singh Vs. Shingara Singh and others was dismissed.

2. Admittedly, in all the three cases Shingara Singh and Anmol

Singh are common parties. In suit titled as 'Shingara Singh Vs. Paramjit Kaur and others', Sukhwinder Kaur, Randhir Kaur and Paramjit Kaur apart from Anmol Singh are defendants. In the suit titled 'Anmol Singh Vs. Shingara Singh and others' filed by Anmol Singh, Shingara Singh, Kawaljit Singh, Harpreet Singh and Gulzar Singh have been impleaded as defendants. In civil suit titled as Shingara Singh vs. Kulbir Singh, apart from Anmol Singh, Kulbir Singh and Paramjit Singh are defendants. Therefore, except for Shingara Singh and Anmol Singh, the other defendants are different in all the suits. The nature of all the 3 suits is also different. Case titled 'Shingara Singh Vs. Paramjit Kaur and others' is a suit for declaration, 'Shingara Singh Vs. Kulbir Singh and others' is a suit for permanent injunction whereas case titled 'Anmol Singh Vs. Shingara Singh and others' is a suit for permanent injunction. The claim sought by plaintiff in all 3 suits is differently worded against different defendants.

3. In these circumstances, I do not find any error in the impugned order dated 11.07.2025 (Annexure P-8) passed by Court of First Instance vide which the Court had decided to try all the three suits separately.

4. In view of the fact that all the three suits are pending in the same Court and are being tried by same Presiding Officer, the possibility of conflicting judgment is ruled out. Admittedly, in suits titled as 'Shingara Singh Vs. Paramjit Kaur and others - Civil Suit No. 409 of 2020 and 'Shingara Singh Vs. Kulbir Singh' - Civil Suit No. 343 of 2020, substantial evidence of plaintiff stands recorded and it is at the fag end of plaintiff's evidence. Therefore, no interference at this stage is made out. Consolidation of suits at this stage, would be against the interest of the parties and no

prejudice is caused by not consolidating the cases. The interest of justice would be met if all the three suits are decided by the same Court. It is, accordingly, directed that in the eventuality of any transfer, all the 3 cases would be transferred to one Court.

5. All the three revision petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.

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

26.08.2025

Janki

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No