



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

125

**CR-2524-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision:18.03.2026**

MAYA RANI

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

MANJIT KAUR AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. C.S. Bakshi, Advocate (through VC) and
Ms. Mallika Passi, Advocate
for petitioner.

PARMOD GOYAL, J. (ORAL)

Present civil revision under Article 227 of the Constitution of India read with Section 151 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 is preferred by petitioner for issuance of direction to Court below to decide his application under Order IX Rule 13 read with Section 151 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for setting aside the *ex parte* judgment and decree dated 31.10.2025 (Annexure P-1) along with application under Section 151 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 seeking stay of operation of said *ex parte* judgment and decree.

2. It is the case of petitioner that she was arrayed as defendant in the suit titled as Manjit Kaur Shoker and Others versus Dilbag Singh and Others preferred by respondents No.1 to 7 seeking declaration that mutation order No.3061 decided on 30.11.2016 as regards to inheritance of Ujjagar Singh is void, nonest, inoperative, fraudulent and got sanctioned by respondent No.9-defendant No.2 in the fraudulent manner.

3. It is the case of petitioner that her address was wrongly mentioned and service was got effected through Munadi by asserting her to

be resident of village Poonia, whereas petitioner had never resided in village Poonia and rather is resident of Mukandpur, Nawanshahr, Punjab.

4. Reliance is placed by petitioner on aadhaar card issued on 23.07.2020 showing her to be resident of Mukandpur, sale deed which was subject matter of mutation order No.3061, where also petitioner was recorded as resident of village Mukandpur as well as report of process server, wherein it was reported that petitioner was not found at village Poonia and despite directions by Court to furnish correct addresses, respondent Nos.1 to 7-plaintiffs insisted that the address given is the last known address of the petitioner and got her served through Munadi in village Poonia, instead of furnishing correct address.

5. It is the case of petitioner that despite filing of application for stay, appearance as well as reply by respondent Nos.1 to 7-plaintiffs, no stay has been granted till date. It is asserted that the matter is now fixed for 23.03.2026 for arguments on stay application.

6. Keeping in view facts and circumstances of the present case, learned Court, where applications filed by petitioner are pending, is directed to decide the application for stay of operation of judgment and decree dated 31.10.2025 on date fixed i.e. 23.03.2026 or within 15 days from 23.03.2026 in case any adjournment is justified on 23.03.2026.

7. Present revision petition is disposed of in above terms.

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

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

18.03.2026

Sunil Chander

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*