



118
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-2338-2026(O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.03.2026

PARAMJIT KAUR CHADHA

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

CALVETON DMCC AND OTHERS

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Aashish Chopra, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Rupa Pathania, Advocate,
Mr. Ashish Kundu, Advocate, for the petitioner.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 08.10.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Additional District Judge-cum-Presiding Judge, Exclusive Commercial Court, Gurugram, whereby the application filed by the petitioner under Order I Rule 10(2) of the Code of Civil Procedure seeking deletion of the name of the petitioner from the array of parties has been dismissed and also the order dated 06.02.2026 (Annexure P-2), whereby the application filed by the petitioner under Section 151 of the CPC for tendering certain documents has been dismissed.

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the impugned order, which was passed on the application filed by the petitioner under Order I Rule 10(2) read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil of



Civil Procedure has been passed on the basis of wrong information supplied by the decree holder that the petitioner, who was impleaded as judgment debtor No.2, was a transferee pendente lite, whereas in fact the shares were transferred to the petitioner on 19.08.2017, whereas the arbitration proceedings commenced in the month of January 2018 and no shares were transferred to the petitioner after the commencement of the arbitration proceedings and that was the reason the petitioner was neither impleaded as a party before the Arbitral Tribunal nor before any other Court. He submitted that in this way, the Executing Court proceeded on the basis of misrepresentation made by the decree-holder in this regard and the petitioner has been unnecessarily impleaded as a party in the execution proceedings.

3. Notice of motion to respondent No.1 only.

4. At this stage, Mr. Manish Jain, learned Senior Counsel with Mr. Raghav Kakkar, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondent No.1 and submitted that he has instructions to state that respondent No.1 does not have any objection in case the name of the petitioner is deleted from the array of the parties before the Executing Court and respondent No.1 has no objection in case the aforesaid order dated 08.10.2025 (Annexure P-1) is set aside. He submitted that at the time when the stand was taken before the Executing Court that the petitioner was a transferee pendente lite, respondent No.1 was not aware of the true factual position. He submitted that however so far as the second prayer made by the petitioner, whereby challenge has been laid to the order dated 06.02.2026 is concerned, the same cannot be permitted in view of the fact when the petitioner will no longer



be a party to the proceedings before the Executing Court, no such prayer can be granted to permit her to place on record some documents.

5. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the statement made by learned Senior Counsel for respondent No.1, the present petition can be disposed of accordingly. He submitted that so far as the first prayer made with regard to the deletion of the petitioner is concerned, the order dated 08.10.2025 may be set aside in view of the statement made by learned Senior Counsel for respondent No.1 and so far as the second prayer with regard to placing on record some documents is concerned, the same has now become infructuous.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned Senior Counsels for the parties, the present petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 08.10.2025 (Annexure P-1) is hereby set aside. The name of the petitioner shall stand deleted from the array of parties before the Executing Court. Insofar as the second prayer challenging the order dated 06.02.2026 (Annexure P-2) is concerned, the same has been rendered infructuous in view of the fact that the petitioner will no longer be a party to the proceedings before the Executing Court.

12.03.2026

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)

rakesh

JUDGE

Whether speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No