



113

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

CR-2773-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.03.2026

SAROJ ALIAS SAROJ CHAUHAN

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

RAJBALA AND OTHERS

..RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. Onkar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aashish Chopra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Abhishek Kansal, Advocate
Mr. Vijender Parmar, Advocate
for respondent No.1 and 2.

PARMOD GOYAL, J. (Oral)

The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India by the petitioner-defendant being aggrieved by order dated 17.03.2026 (Annexure P-7) vide which appeal preferred by plaintiff-respondent against dismissal of application for ad-interim injunction vide order dated 22.09.2025 (Annexure P-6) was allowed.

Admittedly, in the present case application under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 is pending before the Court of first instance and has not been decided yet.

In view of pendency of application it would be appropriate in the present case, to direct the Court of first instance to decide application under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 preferred by plaintiff in time bound manner preferably in 15 days from receipt of copy of this order. The order dated

17.03.2026 passed by learned First Appellate Court shall remain operative till application under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 is decided.

It is further made clear that the order passed by Court of first instance would be passed by taking facts and circumstances of the present case as pleaded by parties, principle of law and keeping in view the golden rules required to be established for interim injunction. Further Court of first instance shall not be influenced by finding given by it earlier or findings recorded by the Appellate Court in appeal which is impugned before this Court.

The revision petition is accordingly disposed of with above directions.

March 27, 2026
poonam

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No