

CR-7562-2018 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(261)

CR-7562-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: - 28.08.2025

Greater Mohali Area Development Authority (GMADA) through its
Estate Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

Narvinderjit Singh and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present civil revision has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the impugned order dated 24.04.2018 (Annexure P-5) and impugned order dated 24.09.2018 (Annexure P-7) passed by the ACJ (SD), Mohali.

2. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 has submitted that the suit filed by respondent No.1 against Pritpal Kaur, who was the admitted owner, was dismissed but the appeal filed by respondent No.1 was allowed on 28.08.2017 and respondent No.1-plaintiff was declared to be the owner of the property in question. It is further submitted that the transfer made by said Pritpal Kaur during the pendency of the appeal

which was hit by the principle of *lis pendens*, has been held to be void in the execution proceedings vide order dated 24.09.2018. It is further submitted that the objections filed by the purchasers had also been dismissed. In the said circumstances, it is submitted that the present petitioner/GMADA has no locus to file the present revision petition and it is their duty to implement the judgment of the court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there are certain formalities which are to be completed for the execution of the sale deed in favour of respondent No.1 in pursuance of the judgment and decree dated 28.08.2017 which has attained finality and the respondent No.1 be directed to complete the formalities in accordance with law. It is submitted that in case the respondent No.1 would complete the said formalities then the sale deed would be executed as expeditiously as possible.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 has fairly submitted that they would complete all formalities as are required in law.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in view of the above, the present revision petition be disposed of and the impugned orders be upheld.

6. In view of the above, the impugned orders are upheld and the present revision petition is disposed of.

August 28, 2025
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE