

2026:PHHC:003670



CR-3167-2022(O&M) 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-3167-2022(O&M)

Date of decision : 14.01.2026

Jaimal Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Raj Kumar Mehta and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Sherry K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Manpreet, Advocate for
Mr.Saurabh Bajaj, Advocate
for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the impugned order dated 29.07.2021 (Annexure P-4) passed by the Additional Civil Judge (Sr.Div.), Mansa and order dated 04.03.2022 (Annexure P-6) passed by the Additional District Judge, Mansa, vide which the application as well as the appeal under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC read with Section 151 CPC filed by the petitioner for grant of temporary injunction has been dismissed.

2. On 09.08.2022, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

“Present: Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

2026:PHHC:003670



CR-3167-2022(O&M) 2

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the pahi has been existing since the time of consolidation and also finds mention in the order dated 27.03.1976 passed by the Consolidation Officer. It is further the contention of learned counsel that as per the report dated 24.04.2021 of the Naib Tehsildar, the existing pahi has been blocked on temporary basis by overturning the trolley in the passage comprised in Khasra No.47//2 and pahi No.1292 out of Khasra No.47//5, 48//1, 2, 3.

Notice of motion returnable 08.02.2023.

Meanwhile, status quo as it exists today shall be maintained.

09.08.2022

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the said order was passed in the year 2022 and has continued for a period of more than 3 years and 5 months. It is submitted that the main suit was filed in the year 2020 and the suit was for permanent injunction and has thus submitted that the interim order be continued till the pendency of the suit.

4. Learned counsel for respondents has submitted that the grant of interim order and continuation of the same should not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court be directed to decide the main suit independently after hearing both the parties and after taking into consideration the pleadings and the evidence on record. It is further submitted that since the suit is for permanent injunction and is of the year 2020, the trial Court be requested to decide the same expeditiously.

5. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances and the fair stand taken by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for respondents, the present petition is disposed of with the following directions:-



- i) Interim order dated 09.08.2022 granting “status quo as it exists today” would continue till the time the suit is decided and the grant and continuance of the said interim order would not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case. It would be open to both the parties to raise all pleas as are available to them and the trial Court would decide the same after taking into consideration the pleadings and the evidence of the parties.
- ii) Since the suit is of the year 2020, the trial Court is requested to decide the suit as expeditiously as possible. Both the counsel are requested to fully assist the trial Court in expeditious disposal of the suit.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

January 14, 2026.
Davinder Kumar

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