



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

1. CR-1672-2025

Krishna Devi

... Petitioner

Versus

Reena Garg and another

... Respondents

2. CR-1660-2025

Hari Ram and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Reena Garg

... Respondent

Date of decision : 03.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) and
Petitioner no.3 Jatinder Bansal in person in CR-1660-2025
(through V.C.).

Mr. Sidharth Gupta, Advocate
for the respondent(s).

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This order will dispose of two civil revision petitions i.e., CR-



1672-2025 and CR-1660-2025.

2. CR-1672-2025 has been filed by Krishna Devi (plaintiff in civil suit no.373-2021) in which challenge is to the order dated 21.01.2025 (Annexure P-5) passed by the Additional District Judge, Bathinda, vide which the appeal filed by respondent no.1 (defendant no.1) has been allowed and the order dated 13.07.2022 passed by the trial Court in the proceedings under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC has been set aside. CR-1660-2025 has been filed by Hari Ram, Krishna Devi and Jatinder Bansal (defendants in civil suit no.293-2021) in which challenge is to the order dated 21.01.2025 (Annexure P-3) passed by the Additional District Judge, Bathinda as well as order dated 06.08.2021 (Annexure P-2) passed by the trial Court vide which the application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC filed by the respondent-Reena Garg (plaintiff) has been allowed in the civil suit filed by respondent Reena Garg.

3. The present two revision petitions arise from two civil suits filed by one Krishna Devi and other by Reena Garg. Both the civil suits were listed on the same date before the trial Court.

4. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners, on instructions from the petitioners, has submitted that he be permitted to withdraw both the revision petitions with liberty to raise all pleas which are available to them during the course of trial. It is submitted that observations made in the impugned orders be not construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court be directed to decide



the cases independently. It is further submitted that the suits are of the year 2021 and thus, the trial Court be requested to decide the same as expeditiously as possible.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent has submitted that he has no objection to the said course of action but has submitted that the respondent be permitted to raise all pleas as are available to her during the course of trial.

6. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the petitioner(s) are permitted to withdraw the present revision petitions. Liberty is granted to the parties to raise all pleas as are available to them during the course of the trial.

7. It is a matter of settled law that the observations made in the application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC are only for the purpose of deciding the interim injunction and the same do not have any bearing on the final judgment. Accordingly, the trial Court would decide the main suits independently, in accordance with law. The trial Court is also requested to decide the suits as expeditiously as possible since both the suits are of the year 2021. The counsel appearing for the all the parties would fully assist the trial Court in expeditious disposal of the case.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

February 03, 2026.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No