



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

(268)

CR-671-2020

Date of decision: - 25.02.2026

Murti Devi

....Petitioner

Versus

Arjan Dev and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Senior Advocate, with  
Mr. Naveen Jhajholia, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate  
for the respondents.

\*\*\*\*

**VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**

1. Present civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the impugned order dated 13.12.2019 (Annexure P9) passed by the Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Safidon, vide which objections filed by the petitioner have been dismissed.
2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner had filed an application dated 16.11.2018 (Annexure P-7) and in the said application various objections were raised although in the head note of the said application, it was mentioned that the same was for dismissal of the execution petition summarily. It is further submitted that, in effect, the same were objections to the execution and the Executing



Court should have considered those objections and decided the same. It is argued that the Executing Court has not considered the said objections and has rejected the same by treating the application to be an application for summary dismissal of the execution petition. It is further argued that in the said circumstances, the order dated 13.12.2019 be set aside and the Executing Court be directed to treat the application dated 16.11.2018 as objections and consider the objections which have been raised in the body of the said application.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that the respondents have already filed a reply to the said application and even on merits have opposed the said application and has further submitted that since the execution petition had been filed on 17.08.2018, thus, in case the Executing Court is to re-decide the objections, then, the Executing Court be directed to decide the same in a time bound manner, after hearing both the parties concerned.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the said course of action.

5. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances and the fair stand taken on behalf of the petitioner as well as on behalf of the respondents, the impugned order dated 13.12.2019 is set aside and the present revision petition is disposed of with the following observations/directions: -

- (i) The application dated 16.11.2018 (Annexure P-7) would be treated as objections filed by the petitioner to the execution proceedings in which the reply dated 07.12.2018 has already



been filed by the respondents.

- (ii) Since the date given by the Executing Court is 25.05.2026, it has been jointly prayed that both the parties through counsel would appear before the Executing Court on 16.03.2026 and would move an application for preponement and on the said application, the Executing Court is directed to prepone the case to a date which is within three weeks from 16.03.2026.
- (iii) On the date so fixed, counsel for both the parties would be fully prepared to argue on the said objection petition. Counsel for the parties, as undertaken before this Court, would also be ready to argue on the said objections on any other date given by the Executing Court.
- (iv) Since the execution has been pending since the year 2018, thus, the Executing Court is requested to decide the same as expeditiously as possible.
- (v) It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the objections and it would be open to both the parties to raise all pleas in accordance with law before the Executing Court.

**February 25, 2026**  
*naresh.k*

**( VIKAS BAHL )**  
**JUDGE**

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