



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

129

RSA-2857-2019 (O&M)

Date of decision : 11.05.2026

Joginder Singh and others**..... Appellants****versus****Parmod Bhushan Paul and others****..... Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Mr. Shruti Jain, Advocate
for the appellants.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. Defendants are in second appeal. For convenience, parties are hereinafter referred to by their original position in the suit, i.e. the appellants as defendants and respondents as plaintiffs.

2. Plaintiff filed suit for permanent injunction apprehending dispossession at the hands of the defendants. Defendants resisted the suit claiming their possession. As per defendants, the suit land is in their possession and wheat crops sown by them are standing over the suit land. From the records, it is discernible that decree dated 13.12.1980 Ex.PW1/1 was passed in favour of the plaintiff in a suit titled as "*Parmod Bhushan vs. Bachan Singh*". In execution thereof, the plaintiff was put in actual possession and the same was reported vide rapat No.101 dated 25.11.2010 Ex.PW/1/3/B on the basis of warrant of possession issued by Executing Court.

3. Counsel for the appellants would submit that the defendants filed application seeking correction of Khasra Girdawari. The same was



appeal filed by plaintiff against the same was dismissed.

4. In the considered opinion of this Court, the order passed by the Revenue Court correcting Khasra Giradawari during the pendency of the *lis* does not aid or advance the cause of the defendants. The findings and the orders passed by the Revenue court are not binding upon the Civil Court, whereas the Revenue Courts are bound by the orders passed by the Civil Courts.

5. There being overwhelming evidence to prove that the plaintiff was put in possession of suit land pursuant to the execution of the decree dated 13.12.1980 which concededly has attained finality between the parties, this Court finds no reason to interfere in the well reasoned findings recorded by the Courts below allowing the suit filed by the plaintiff granting decree of permanent injunction.

6. Finding no merit in the present appeal, the same is ordered to be dismissed.

7. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

11.05.2026

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No