



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

111

**CR-3677-2026****Date of decision: 01.05.2026**

Dhanpati

...Petitioner

Versus

Jaibir Singh and others

.... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Ranjeet K. Jaswal, Advocate,  
through V.C. &  
Ms. Sandeep Kaur, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 29.07.2025 (Annexure P-9), passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Safidon, District Jind, whereby the application filed by the petitioner under Section 151 CPC for early hearing of the matter has been dismissed. It is further prayed that a direction be issued to the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Safidon for expeditious disposal of the application filed under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC in a time-bound manner.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner–Dhanpati filed a suit for declaration to the effect that she is the absolute owner in possession of the suit property. She also sought a declaration that the judgment and decree dated 23.12.1993 passed in favour of defendant No.1 are illegal, ineffective, null and void. Further, she challenged the sale deed dated 20.02.2025



allegedly executed by defendant No.1 in favour of defendant No.2, as well as the sale deed dated 27.02.2025 allegedly executed by defendant No.1 in favour of defendant No.2. She also sought declaration with respect to the sale deed dated 18.07.2016 allegedly executed by defendant No.1 in favour of defendant No.3 and further challenged the sale deed dated 08.02.2021 allegedly executed by defendant No.3 in favour of defendant No.4. In addition, the petitioner sought a decree for permanent injunction restraining the defendants from further alienating, selling, mortgaging, or creating any third-party rights over the suit property. Notice of the said suit was issued to the respondents, who appeared through their counsel.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that only respondents No.2 to 4 have filed their written statements, whereas respondent No.1 has not filed the written statement till date. It is further contended that the petitioner had moved an application under Section 151 CPC for preponement/early hearing of the matter with a view to secure adjudication of the stay application. However, the learned trial Court, without adverting to the merits of the case, dismissed the said application under Section 151 CPC. It is further submitted that a direction be issued to the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Safidon, to decide the stay application filed under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC, upon filing of the written statement by respondent No.1.

4. Considering the limited nature of relief sought, issuance of notice to the respondents is dispensed with, as the same would only result in further delay in the proceedings.



5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have perused the paper book.
6. Keeping in view the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present revision petition is disposed of with a direction to the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Safidon, to decide the application filed under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC as expeditiously as possible, upon filing of the written statement by respondent No.1.
7. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.
8. Registry is directed to send a copy of this order forthwith to the learned learned Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Safidon, for strict compliance.

May 01, 2026  
*anil*

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)  
JUDGE

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