



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

(124)

CR-2435-2026

Date of Decision: **16.03.2026**

SATISH KUMAR

... Petitioner

Versus

RANI DEVI AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has instituted the present Civil Revision Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, invoking the supervisory jurisdiction of this Court for setting aside the impugned order dated 18.02.2026 (Annexure P-9) passed by the learned District Judge, Panchkula, whereby the application filed by the petitioner seeking transfer of the rent appeals titled as Satish Vs. Jatinder (RA/22/2019) (Annexure P-1); Satish Kumar Vs. Harish Kumar (RA/13/2024) (Annexure P-2); Kuldeep Vs. Amrit Khanna & Others (RA/2/2025) (Annexure P-3); Gagan Vs. Nirmala (RA/11/2020) (Annexure P-4); Rani Vs. Kajal (RA/18/2019) (Annexure P-5); Prem Chand through LRs. Vs. Nirmala (CA/10/2025) (Annexure P-6); and Sonu Vs. Kuldeep (CA/11/2025) (Annexure P-7) to a single Court for consolidated adjudication, so as to obviate the possibility of conflicting orders or judgments, as the application for the same has



been illegally and arbitrarily declined by the learned District Judge, Panchkula.

1.1. It is further prayed that, during the pendency of the present petition, the proceedings in the aforesaid matters pending before the learned Courts below may kindly be stayed, in the interest of justice and to prevent multiplicity of proceedings and inconsistent adjudication.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that several litigations are pending between the parties and the subject matter involved in all the cases is substantially identical. It is contended that the property involved in the said litigations belongs to Jangli Ram (since deceased) and is situated in Khasra No. 2014, and the parties to the disputes are his legal heirs ('LR' for short). The details of such litigations have been placed on record (Annexures P-1 to P-7), which clearly reflect that the disputes arise out of the same property and involve substantially similar questions of fact and law.

2.1. It is further submitted that in order to avoid conflicting decisions and to facilitate proper adjudication, the petitioner moved an application dated 22.05.2025 before the learned District Judge, Panchkula seeking that the aforesaid matters be entrusted to one Court for adjudication. However, the learned Court below dismissed the said application vide order dated 18.02.2026 (Annexure P-9) on the ground that a civil appeal and rent appeals cannot be consolidated.

2.2. Learned counsel contends that the impugned order proceeds on a clear misapprehension of the relief sought by the petitioner. It is argued that the petitioner had not sought consolidation of the proceedings,



but had merely prayed that the matters be assigned to one Court so as to avoid the possibility of conflicting judgments in respect of the same property between the same parties.

2.3. It is thus submitted that the learned Court below failed to appreciate the prayer of the petitioner in its correct perspective and declined the application on an erroneous premise, resulting in miscarriage of justice. The impugned order, therefore, being legally unsustainable, deserves to be set aside in exercise of the supervisory jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

3. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and have perused the paper-book thoroughly.

4. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the learned District Judge has declined the prayer of the petitioner primarily on the ground that the proceedings sought to be transferred arise under different statutory frameworks, including civil appeals and rent appeals, and involve distinct causes of action and issues which require independent adjudication. The learned District Judge has further observed that each of the matters is required to be decided on its own merits, on the basis of the evidence adduced on record as well as the respective pleadings and factual matrix of each case. In such circumstances, the learned District Judge has rightly concluded that the matters cannot be clubbed together or entrusted to a single Court merely on the premise that the property involved may be common.

4.1. It is well settled that the supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is of a limited and circumscribed nature



and is intended to ensure that subordinate Courts act within the bounds of their authority. The said jurisdiction is not meant to correct every error of fact or law, nor can it be exercised to substitute the discretion of the subordinate Court with that of this Court.

4.2. The Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Shalini Shyam Shetty v. Rajendra Shankar Patil, (2010) 8 SCC 329***, has categorically held that “*the power under Article 227 is to be exercised sparingly and only in cases of patent perversity, gross miscarriage of justice, or flagrant violation of law, and not as a routine appellate or revisional jurisdiction*”.

4.3. Similarly, in ***Radhey Shyam v. Chhabi Nath, (2015) 5 SCC 423***, the Hon'ble Apex Court reiterated that “*the supervisory jurisdiction cannot be invoked to interfere with every interlocutory order passed by a subordinate Court unless the order suffers from a manifest jurisdictional error*”.

4.4. In the present case, the impugned order reflects a reasoned exercise of discretion by the learned District Judge. The proceedings sought to be transferred arise out of different statutory provisions and involve distinct issues requiring separate adjudication, and therefore the view taken by the learned District Judge cannot be said to suffer from any jurisdictional error, perversity, or illegality warranting interference by this Court in exercise of its powers under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Merely because the property involved in the disputes may be common would not, by itself, justify the assignment of all proceedings to one Court when the nature of the proceedings, the issues involved, and the governing legal framework are materially different.



4.5. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court finds no justification to interfere with the impugned order dated 18.02.2026 (Annexure P-9). The present petition, being devoid of merit, is accordingly **dismissed**.

5. It is, however, clarified that the observations recorded here-in-above are purely for the purposes of adjudication of the present petition and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the underlying disputes pending between the parties. All such observations are confined strictly to the limited scope of the controversy examined in the present proceedings and shall not, in any manner, prejudice or influence the rights, claims, or contentions of the parties in any other pending or future proceedings. Nor shall the same be treated as a determination of any substantive question of fact or law arising in the main matters.

16.03.2026
Gaurav Sorot

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

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