



126

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

CR-2740-2026**Date of Decision: 25.03.2026****MUJIB KUMAR**

..... Petitioner

*Versus***STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS**

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Sandeep Jasuja, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ishan Kaushal, AAG, Punjab
for respondents No.1 to 6 (Through V.C.)

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. This revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is directed against the order dated 11.09.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Sri Muktsar Sahib and the orders dated 18.03.2026 (Annexure P-4/A) and order dated 18.03.2026 (Annexure P-8) passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the material placed on the file.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that he stood as a surety of respondents No.7 and 8 before the Excise Authorities and now a recovery certificate for recovery of Rs.36,57,183/- has been issued against him under the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1987. He has filed a suit challenging the said recovery proceedings. The Trial Court, vide order



dated 11.09.2025, directed him to deposit 1/3rd of the amount and disposed of the injunction application with the observation that in case, he deposits 1/3rd of the disputed amount, his property shall not be put to sale, but if he fails to deposit 1/3rd of the total amount, the stay order will stand vacated and defendants No.1 to 3 will have every right to deal with the property of the plaintiff by putting the same to sale in auction proceedings. Against the order dated 11.09.2025 (Annexure P-1), the petitioner-plaintiff has instituted an appeal which is pending in the Court of Addl. District Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib. Neither any order has been passed on the application for stay moved by him nor has his appeal been disposed of and on the other hand, defendants No.1 to 3 are threatening to sell the property owned by the petitioner and in case, the appeal is not decided or an order of stay is not passed, his suit will become infructuous.

4. The grievance of the petitioner appears to be well-founded and accordingly, the learned Appellate Court is directed to decide the appeal instituted by the petitioner expeditiously or to decide the stay application and in the meanwhile, the property owned by the petitioner shall not be put to sale.

5. In view of the above, the present petition stands disposed of.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

25.03.2026
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No