



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

139

CR-2965-2026

Date of decision: 06.04.2026

NARINDER GROVER

....Petitioner

Versus

SUMIT MOHAN

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Dr. Sumati Jhund, Advocate for the petitioner.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. The present revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for setting aside the order dated 05.03.2026 (Annexure P-8) passed by learned Additional District Judge, District Ludhiana, in case bearing No. CA/1052/2025 titled “*Narinder Grover vs. Sumit Mohan*”, whereby the said Court has imposed a condition of furnishing security equivalent to decretal amount alongwith interest upto date before the Executing Court within a period of one month from the date of passing of the order.

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

3. In view of the nature of the order proposed to be passed, issuance of notice to the respondent is dispensed with, as it would only delay the proceedings and cause unnecessary expenditure to the respondent.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the trial Court vide judgment and decree dated 18.11.2025 has decreed the suit filed by the plaintiff



- 2-

for recovery of Rs.29 lakhs from the petitioner alongwith interest @ 12% per annum. Against the said judgment and decree, petitioner has instituted an appeal and the Appellate Court vide order dated 05.03.2026 has stayed the operation of the judgment and decree dated 18.11.2025, subject to the condition that petitioner shall furnish security equivalent to the decretal amount alongwith interest upto date before the Executing Court within a period of one month from the date of passing of this order. Learned counsel further contended that the condition imposed by the learned Appellate court is excessive, onerous and oppressive and calling upon the petitioner to furnish security equivalent to the entire decretal amount alongwith interest will defeat the right of appeal of the petitioner. Learned counsel next contended that petitioner is a senior citizen suffering from paralysis and the impugned order violates the principles of natural justice and the same be set aside.

5. However, I do not find any force in the contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. A decree for recovery of Rs.29 lakhs alongwith interest has been passed against petitioner and in an appeal instituted by the petitioner/defendant, the Appellate Court is well within its rights to order conditional stay of the execution of the judgment and decree, subject to furnishing of security equivalent to the decretal amount and interest. No manifest error or material illegality has thus been committed while passing the impugned order and no interference in the said order is called for. However, since petitioner is a senior citizen and stated to be suffering from paralysis, the impugned order is modified to the effect that petitioner is granted three months time to furnish the security instead of one month



as ordered by the Appellate Court.

7. With the aforesaid modification in the order dated 05.03.2026, the present petition is dismissed.

06.04.2026
amandeep

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No