



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(126)

CR No. 2267 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 10.03.2026

Suresh Kumar Ranga

...Petitioner

Versus

Sunita

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Rajnikant Upadhyay, Advocate for the petitioner.

Amarinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting-aside the impugned order dated 11.02.2026 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Bahadurgarh in Civil Suit No. 75 of 2026 titled **Suresh Kumar Ranga Vs. Smt. Sunita**, whereby the prayer for grant of temporary/ad-interim injunction in the application filed under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC by the petitioner/plaintiff has been declined.

2. The record reveals that petitioner–plaintiff Suresh Kumar Ranga has instituted a suit for declaration and permanent injunction against the respondent–defendant Smt. Sunita. Along with the suit, an application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC has also been filed seeking interim protection.

3. Notice of the suit as well as the said application was issued to the respondent. The interim order dated 11.02.2026 reflects that the



respondent–defendant appeared before the trial Court through counsel and a memo of appearance was filed on her behalf. At that stage, a request was made on behalf of the petitioner–plaintiff for grant of ad-interim injunction restraining the respondent from alienating the suit property.

4. It was submitted before the learned trial Court that though the conveyance deed dated 15.12.2021 stands in the name of the respondent–defendant, the entire sale consideration as well as the financial liabilities in respect of the property had been borne by the petitioner–plaintiff. It was further stated that a housing loan of ₹36,00,000/- had been availed from HDFC Bank, Bahadurgarh. However, the learned trial Court, while passing the impugned order, observed that the suit property stands in the name of the respondent–defendant and, being the recorded owner, no injunction could be granted against the true owner. Consequently, the prayer for ad-interim injunction was declined.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the learned trial Court to decide the application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC in a time bound manner.

6. In view of the limited prayer made and the order proposed to be passed, issuance of notice to the respondent is dispensed with, as the same would unnecessarily delay the proceedings and also entail additional expense.

7. Consequently, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present civil revision petition is disposed of with a direction to the learned trial Court to decide the application under Order XXXIX Rules



1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC filed by the petitioner–plaintiff as expeditiously as possible.

8. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

March 10, 2026
kanchan

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No