



234

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

CM-7064-CII-2026 in/and
CR-5645-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.05.2026

Prem Chand and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Dr. Devraj Taneja and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Saurabh Chobey, Advocate for respondent No.1.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

CM-7064-CII-2026

1. This is an application filed under Section 151 CPC for revival of the above mentioned petition.

2. On 03.02.2026, this Court had passed the following order:-

“1. Learned counsel for the respondents has very fairly submitted that in the present case, the matter has been compromised and an amount of Rs.5 lacs has been paid by respondent no.1 (Dr.Dev Raj Tanjea) and the balance amount is to be paid on 28.02.2026. It is submitted that in the said circumstances, the present petition be disposed but liberty be granted to revive the present petition in case any cause still survives.

2. In view of the above, the present revision petition is disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

February 03, 2026”

3. Learned counsel for the applicants-petitioners has submitted that wrong statement has been made on behalf of the respondents to the effect that



the matter has been compromised and that an amount of Rs.5,00,000/- has been paid by respondent No.1 to the petitioners. It is submitted that neither there is any such compromise which has taken place nor any alleged receipt has been signed by the petitioners nor an amount of Rs.5,00,000/- has been received by the petitioners.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents, on instructions from respondent No.1-Dr. Devraj Taneja, could not refer to any receipt which was signed by the petitioners or to any written compromise.

5. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present application is allowed and order dated 03.02.2026 is recalled and the main case is restored to its original number and is taken on Board today itself for final disposal.

Main case

1. This is a revision petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 02.07.2016 (Annexure P-6) passed by the Additional District Judge, Narnaul, whereby, an appeal filed challenging the order dated 11.08.2015 has been dismissed.

2. On 01.09.2016, a Coordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

“Present: Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate for the petitioners.

** * **

Contends that agreement to sell has been admitted and creating third party rights would indulge into multifariousness of the litigation.

Notice of motion for 17.01.2017.

In the meantime, as an interim measure, the respondents are restrained from creating third party rights etc. qua suit



property.

September 01, 2016”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the case is at the final stage and has submitted that both the parties be directed to maintain status quo with respect to the suit property till the decision of the main suit and the present revision petition be disposed of.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that grant and continuance of order of status quo should not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court be directed to consider all the pleas raised by the respondents during the course of arguments.

5. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances and fair stand taken on behalf of the petitioners as well as respondents, the present revision petition is disposed of with the following observations/directions:-

- i) Till the final decision of the suit, status quo regarding alienation and possession with respect to the suit property would be maintained by both the parties.
- ii) Grant and continuance of the said interim should not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and it would be open to both the parties to raise all the pleas in support of their respective pleas before the trial Court and the trial Court would decide the main suit independently.

6. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

11.05.2026

Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No
Whether reportable:- Yes/No