



CR-4293-2024 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-4293-2024 (O&M)

MOHAN VERMA AND ANR.

..Petitioners

Versus

SMT ANJU GARG AND ORS.

..Respondents

Reserved on: 24.03.2026
Pronounced on: 07.04.2026
Uploaded on: 08.04.2026

Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced? NO
Whether full judgment is pronounced? YES

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Anuj Raura, Advocate and
Ms. Bhawna, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Respondent No.1 in person.

Mr. G.S. Sarao, Advocate for
Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate
for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

* * * * *

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition is filed for quashing of judgment dated 23.10.2023 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mansa, whereby appeal filed by the petitioners was held to be not maintainable on the ground that they are third-party objectors.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mansa, wrongly dismissed the appeal filed by the petitioner against order dated 18.07.2023 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Mansa.



3. Per contra, respondent No.1 (in person) and learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 contend that appeal filed by petitioners has been rightly dismissed and there is no infirmity in order dated 23.10.2023.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the whole record of the case with their able assistance.

5. A perusal of the file shows that Anju Garg (respondent No.1 in-person) filed an application in view of the judgment dated 11.08.2015, wherein, while passing the judgment, the Court had specifically restrained the respondents from alienating the share of household without prior permission of the Court so as to secure the rights of respondent No.1 qua her maintenance. She further stated in the application that her mother-in-law and father-in-law have transferred the house in question, i.e. H.No.3712, Sector 46-C, Chandigarh, in favor of Mohan Verma (petitioner No.1) and Pooja Verma (petitioner No.2) through registered sale deed, which is illegal and clear-cut violation of order of the Court.

6. She averred in the application to attach the house in question for the purpose of recovering maintenance amount from her mother-in-law and father-in-law. Notice in the application was issued upon the petitioners. They filed reply to the same and after hearing the parties and perusing the reply, learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Mansa, allowed the application filed by the respondent No.1 in person, and warrants of attachment of house in question was ordered to be issued vide order dated 18.07.2023.

7. Petitioners filed appeal against the same under Section 29 of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, which was



dismissed on 23.10.2023 by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mansa. The challenge in the present civil revision petition is to order dated 23.10.2023.

8. A perusal of the file shows that admittedly respondent No.1 in person filed application for execution of Rs.8,43,500/- as maintenance amount recoverable from her husband and in-laws under Section 12 of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. Her mother-in-law transferred the house in question in favor of third party through registered sale deed. Petitioners, in the application moved by the respondent No.1, filed objections that they are bona fide purchasers and they were not having any knowledge regarding the dispute between the parties. The same is unbelievable. Once a specific order of the Court restraining the in-laws of respondent No.1 from alienating the share of household without prior permission of the Court was passed, the alienation of property thereafter, would amount to violation of order of the Court. Further, perusal of the whole file shows that the petitioner did not take necessary steps to enquire into regarding the property which he purchased as per the maxim buyer beware (caveat emptor).

9. Learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Mansa, has categorically dealt with the response of all the parties and allowed the application filed by respondent No.1. The appeal filed by the petitioners has rightly been rejected by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mansa, after taking into consideration the provision of Section 29 of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. Therefore, I do not find any infirmity in order dated 23.10.2023 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mansa, and the same is hereby upheld.



- 10. In view of the above, present civil revision petition is *dismissed*.
- 11. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

07.04.2026

Sahil/Ayub

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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