



CR-3507-2026

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

(111)

CR-3507-2026

Date of Decision:-24.04.2026

Ram Kumar and Others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Bal Kishan @ Ballu Ram and Others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Abhimanyu Kalsy, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL, J.

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India seeking setting aside of the impugned order dated 07.03.2026 (Annexure P-1), passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Gurugram, whereby the application filed by the petitioners seeking permission to file objections in the execution petition has been dismissed.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the petitioners had earlier filed objections in execution petition bearing No. EXE-271-2024. The learned Executing Court disposed of the said objections and, in consequence thereof, directed the respondent/decreed-holder to file a fresh proposed sale

**CR-3507-2026**

deed, adjourning the matter for that purpose. Thereafter, upon filing of the fresh draft sale deed by the decree-holder, the petitioners moved an application seeking an opportunity to file objections to the said proposed sale deed. However, the learned Executing Court dismissed the said application vide order dated 07.03.2026. Hence, the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, submits that the impugned order is wholly unsustainable in the eyes of law, as the same fails to take into consideration the earlier detailed order passed by the learned Executing Court. He further contends that the matter is presently fixed for registration of the sale deed and the Reader attached to the learned Executing Court has been appointed as Local Commissioner. It is argued that once a fresh document, namely the proposed sale deed pursuant to order dated 17.02.2026, has been brought on record, the petitioners have a valuable right to examine and raise objections thereto. It is further contended that dismissal of the application has caused serious prejudice to the petitioners, who are only seeking one effective opportunity to file objections to the fresh draft sale deed. Accordingly, a prayer has been made for setting aside the impugned order dated 07.03.2026.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners at length and perused the paper book.

5. In view of the order proposed to be passed, notice is not being issued to respondents as it would delay the proceedings besides entailing additional expenses to the respondent.



CR-3507-2026

6. The primary grievance of the petitioners is that they have not been granted an opportunity to file objections to the fresh proposed sale deed submitted by the decree-holder in pursuance of the directions issued by the learned Executing Court. However, a perusal of the record reveals that the petitioners had already availed adequate opportunity to raise objections in the execution proceedings, which were duly considered and adjudicated upon by the learned Executing Court. It is not in dispute that the earlier objections filed by the petitioners stood disposed of and, thereafter, the decree-holder was directed to file a fresh draft sale deed. The subsequent application filed by the petitioners seeking permission to file objections afresh, in essence, amounts to an attempt to reopen issues that have already attained finality. Execution proceedings cannot be permitted to be prolonged indefinitely at the instance of the judgment-debtor under the guise of filing repeated objections. The contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioners that the filing of a fresh proposed sale deed gives rise to a renewed cause to file objections is misconceived and devoid of merit. The said document has been placed on record only in furtherance of the directions already issued by the learned Executing Court and does not confer any fresh or independent right upon the petitioners to reagitate the matter.

7. In view of the above discussion, this Court finds no infirmity or perversity in the impugned order dated 07.03.2026 (Annexure P-1),



CR-3507-2026

passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Gurugram.
Accordingly, the present Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

24.04.2026
Shubham

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