



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

**CR-4017-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 12.05.2026**

Ms. Sonia Sachdeva and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

Naresh Kumar Narula and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present:- Mr. Tarun Singla, Advocate for the petitioners.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J.(ORAL)

Prayer in the present revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution is for setting aside/quashing of order dated 04.04.2025 passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Jalandhar (Annexure P-5) in Civil Suit No.1241 of 2021 instituted on 13.05.2021 whereby dismissing the application filed by petitioners/plaintiff Nos.2 & 3 for issuing directions to respondent No.1 to open lock of the factory premises and to allow petitioners to carry out their business.

(2) As per the brief facts, plaintiffs Nos. 2 & 3/petitioners filed suit for permanent injunction against defendant/respondent No.1 alleging that plaintiffs



Nos. 2 & 3/petitioners are tenants in the premises bearing No.516/326, Basti Nau, Sheikhan Road, Jalandhar. It is alleged that a rent note dated 01.03.2021 was executed by defendant/respondent No.1 in favour of respondent No.2-Firm/plaintiff No.1. Petitioners/plaintiff Nos. 2 & 3 are in possession of entire property bearing No.516/326, Basti Nau, Sheikhan Road, Jalandhar. Defendant/respondent No.1 has opened a Dhaba under the name and style of M/s Apna Punjabi Dhaba and started serving liquor and wine to customers in the said Dhaba. As such, complaints were also moved by the plaintiffs to the police. Defendant/respondent No.1 has no right to use the rented premises or any part of it for his own use much less for any illegal activity, but defendant was adamant and threatened to continue with his nasty designs, hence suit was filed.

(3) During the pendency of said suit, application was filed by plaintiffs Nos. 2 & 3/petitioners (Annexure P-3) for issuance of directions to defendant/respondent No.1 to open lock of the factory premises. It is alleged that suit property measuring 42 marlas is in possession of plaintiffs and defendant/respondent No.1 has put a lock on the main gate of the factory premises with ulterior motive and, thus, plaintiffs Nos. 2 & 3/petitioners cannot enter the factory premises. Accordingly, directions were sought to open the lock and in the alternative, relief was also sought that police help be provided to plaintiffs No. 2 & 3/petitioners for entrance in the factory premises.

(4) Respondent/defendant No.1 filed reply to the written statement (Annexure P-2) as well as reply to said application (Annexure P-4). In the



written statement filed by defendant/respondent No.1, it was alleged that out of total property measuring 42 marlas, area measuring 08 marlas was rented out to Shri Surinder Pal Narang-father of plaintiffs/petitioner Nos.2 & 3 and the tenancy was oral. However, petitioner Nos. 2 & 3 in order to grab the entire property, have forged a rent deed. Against this, plaintiffs Nos. 2 & 3/petitioners filed a police complaint to police. It is categorically alleged that father of plaintiffs Nos. 2 & 3/petitioners had vacated the premises in November-2021 without clearing the arrears of rent. It is further alleged that defendant is authorised to claim the said amount from plaintiffs Nos. 2 & 3/petitioners. Learned trial Court has dismissed the application by passing impugned order dated 04.04.2025 (Annexure P-5), hence, present revision petition has been filed.

(5) I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the paper-book.

(6) Keeping in view the averments of both parties, it is a matter of trial as to whether the premises in question are in possession of plaintiffs Nos. 2 & 3/petitioners or the said premises was vacated by father of plaintiffs Nos. 2 & 3. The petitioners/plaintiff Nos. 2 & 3 could not place on record copy of rent deed; despite an order dated 08.07.2025 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench whereby petitioners are directed to place on record the relevant documents to show the extent of the tenanted area. Both the parties are yet to lead their evidence. At this stage, no documentary evidence is on record, identifying the area on which tenancy having been created between father of plaintiffs Nos. 2 & 3/petitioners and defendant/respondent No.1. In such circumstances, learned trial Court has



rightly declined the issue of direction to defendant/respondent No1 to open lock of premises and has also rightly declined for providing police help to vacate the said premises.

(7) In view of the above, no illegality is found in the impugned order dated 04.04.2025 passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Jalandhar (Annexure P-5), as such, present revision petition is hereby dismissed.

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

12.05.2026
Harish Kumar

(HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No