



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

125

CR-4036-2026

Date of decision: 13.05.2026

Prithi Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Ranbir Singh

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Inderjit Sharma, 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, 1950, for quashing of the impugned order dated 02.04.2026 (Annexure P-7) passed by the learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.)/Executing Court, Gurdaspur, whereby the objections preferred by the petitioner/judgment-debtor in the execution petition have been dismissed.

2. The brief facts of the case are that respondent-Ranbir Singh son of Babu Ram filed a suit for recovery of possession of agricultural land measuring 8 kanals comprised in Khasra No.3//4(8-0), Khatauni No.277, HB No.692, situated in village Chaunta, Tehsil Dinanagar, against the present petitioner-Prithi Singh. Notice of the said suit was issued to the present petitioner, who contested the same by filing a written statement. The learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Gurdaspur, framed as many as 7 issues, including the relief issue. The parties led their respective evidence and, ultimately, the suit filed by the respondent was decreed vide judgment and decree dated 03.01.2024. Thereafter, the respondent/decreed-holder filed an



execution application before the Executing Court. Notice of the said execution application was issued to the present petitioner/judgment-debtor, who filed objections inter alia stating that the respondent had mentioned the wrong khasra number, as Khasra No.3//4(8-0) had been purchased by the present petitioner. It was further pleaded that, inadvertently, Khasra No.4//3(8-0) had been mentioned in the sale deed instead of Khasra No.3//4(8-0). However, the learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Gurdaspur, after hearing learned counsel for the parties, dismissed the objections filed by the present petitioner vide impugned order dated 02.04.2026.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner/judgment-debtor submits that against the judgment and decree dated 03.01.2024, the petitioner/judgment-debtor has already preferred an appeal before the learned First Appellate Court, Gurdaspur, and the same is presently pending consideration. It is further contended that an incorrect khasra number was inadvertently mentioned in the sale deed, as the petitioner had actually purchased land comprised in Khasra No.3//4(8-0). However, taking advantage of the wrongly mentioned Khasra No.4//3(8-0) in the sale deed, the present respondent/decreed-holder is seeking possession of the property in question.

4. Considering the limited nature of relief sought, issuance of notice to the respondent 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 with his able assistance.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, without commenting upon the actual merits of the case, the present revision petition



is disposed of with a direction to the learned First Appellate Court to make an endeavour to dispose of the appeal preferred by the petitioner as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of six months from today and till the disposal of aforesaid appeal, the operation of the impugned order dated 02.04.2026 (Annexure P-7) shall remain stayed.

- 7. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.
- 8. Registry is directed to send a copy of this order each to the Executing Court and First Appellate Court forthwith for necessary compliance.

May 13, 2026
anil

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes / No

Whether reportable

:

Yes / No