



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

**CR No.1005 of 2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-30.04.2026**

Municipal Council, Narnaul

.....Petitioner.

Versus

Gayatri Devi and others

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pranav Arora, Advocate for
Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J.(Oral)

1. The instant revision petition assails the order dated 28.01.2022 (Annexure P-2) passed by the Court of Additional District Judge, Narnaul, allowing the appeal against the order dated 06.01.2022 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Court of Civil Judge (Junior Division), Narnaul.
2. A suit for permanent injunction had been filed by the respondents-plaintiffs against the petitioners-defendants, accompanied by an application under Order 39 Rules 1 & 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (for short, 'CPC') for the grant of ad-interim injunction.
3. Vide order dated 06.01.2022 (Annexure P-1), the said application for the grant of ad-interim injunction was dismissed.

4. The respondents-plaintiffs instituted an appeal against the said order which was allowed by the Court of Additional District Judge, Narnaul vide order dated 28.01.2022 (Annexure P-2).

5. The petitioners-defendants wanted to construct a road and lay a sewer line. However, the shop of the respondents-plaintiffs, which is stated to have been leased out to them, was coming in the way. Since efforts were being made to construct a road and lay the sewer line, the suit was instituted.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the road has now been constructed and the sewer line has been laid. It has also been submitted that in terms of the policy of the Government, an application had been moved by the respondents-plaintiffs for execution and registration of the sale deed of the shop in question in favour of the respondents-plaintiffs. Learned counsel further submits that he is not aware as regards the decision on the said application.

7. Learned counsel for the respondents-plaintiffs also submits that he has no instructions in this regard.

8. As recorded by the first Appellate Court, since the road already stands constructed and the sewer line has been laid, nothing substantive survives in the present revision petition.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that since the suit is pending for the last almost 4½ years, a direction be issued to the Court concerned to decide the same in a time bound manner.

10. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel

for the parties, no fault is found with the order dated 28.01.2022 passed by the first Appellate Court more so, because the road already stands constructed and the sewer line stands laid.

11. Accordingly, no interference is called for in the impugned order and the revision petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

12. However, the trial Court is directed to make earnest efforts to decide the case expeditiously.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

April 30, 2026
Yag Dutt

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No