



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

(108)

RA-26-2023 IN CR-5521-2022

Date of Decision:-19.09.2025

RENU GUPTA AND OTHERS

... Non-applicants/Petitioners

Versus

M/S PIONEER TIMBER PRODUCTS AND ANOTHER

...Applicants/Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Divanshu Jain, Advocate,
for the appellants.

Mr. Chetan Mittal Singh, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Gaurav Mohunta, Advocate,
Mr. Gaurav Gogna, Advocate, and
Mr. Pratyush Sood, Advocate,
for the respondents.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)***CM-3270-CII-2023***

The present application has been filed to condone the delay of 1 day in re-filing the present review petition. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the delay in re-filing the review petition is ordered to be condoned.

CM-5889-CII-2023

Dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

RA-26-2023

The applicants/respondents has filed this review application for recalling the order dated 29.11.2022, vide which, the revision petition filed by the non-applicants/petitioners was allowed and the matter was remanded to the appellate authority for fresh adjudication and for deciding the appeal on all issues and the present review application has been filed by the applicants on the ground that before passing the order by this Court, applicants/respondents were



not heard. No notice was issued and furthermore it has been pointed out that in the order itself, a liberty has been granted to the applicants/respondents/tenants to get the order recalled in case they feel that any prejudice has been suffered by them.

Counsel for the applicants/respondents submitted that by that order, the order of Appellate Authority which was in favour of applicants has been set at naught, so that has caused serious prejudice to the applicants and he should be heard at least before setting aside that order.

Counsel for the non-applicants/petitions contended that there is no merits in the review application as revision petition has been decided by this Court by a well reasoned order and the same does not call for any review.

After going through the order passed by this Court, I am of the considered opinion that review application of the applicants should be allowed and applicants be given an opportunity to be heard on merits of the revision petition. Accordingly, the review application is allowed and the revision petition is restored at original number.

Review application stands disposed of.

CR-5521-2022

Notice of motion.

Mr. Gaurav Mohunta, advocate accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

Adjourned for 30.09.2025.

Be shown immediately after urgent list.

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

19.09.2025
S. Pathania

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