



337

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

1. CR-7064-2024
Date of decision: 04.02.2026

Jasvir Kaur and another
...Petitioners

Versus

Baljit Singh
...Respondent

2. CR-7067-2024
Date of decision: 04.02.2026

Jasvir Kaur and another
...Petitioners

Versus

Baljit Singh
...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Jagjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.
(In both cases)

Mr. K.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the respondent.
(In both cases)

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. The present order would dispose of two civil revisions. First civil revision being CR-7064-2024 filed by the petitioners who are the plaintiff and the proforma defendant, in which challenge was to the order dated 30.10.2024 (Annexure P-8) passed by the Additional District &



Sessions Judge, Kapurthala, whereby the order dated 29.08.2024 (Annexure P-5) passed by the trial Court has been set aside in the proceedings arising under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC. Second civil revision being CR-7067-2024 has also been filed by the same petitioners challenging the same order, vide which injunction application of the counter claimant has been allowed.

2. On 09.12.2024, a Coordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

*“Present: Mr. Jagjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. K.S. Dadwal, Advocate and
Ms. Neha Jain, Advocate for the respondent.*

Mr. K.S. Dadwal, Advocate has filed Power of Attorney on behalf of the respondent/caveator in the Court, which is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the respondent/caveator seeks time to complete instructions and to place on record the documents he intends to rely upon at the time of arguments.

At his request, list on 29.01.2025.

In the meanwhile, as a one time interim measure, parties are directed to maintain status quo as it exists as on today till the next date of hearing before this Court.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

December 09, 2024”

3. A perusal of the same would show that the said order was passed in the year 2024 and it was observed that status quo as it exists today shall be maintained. The said interim order is continuing and it has been brought to the notice of this Court that case is now fixed for defendants evidence and thus, the suit has made much progress.



4. During the course of arguments, it has been jointly submitted that the said interim order of status quo be continued till the time the suit is finally decided and have further submitted that grant of and continuance of the said status quo order should not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court be directed to decide the case independently, in accordance with law.

5. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances and fair stand taken on behalf of learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned counsel for the respondent, both the revision petitions are disposed of with the following observations/directions:-

- i) Interim order dated 09.12.2024 (direction to maintain status quo as it exists today) would continue till the time the suit is finally decided.
- ii) Grant of and continuance of the said interim order should not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court is directed to decide the case after hearing both the parties independently, in accordance with law

6. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

04.02.2026

Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No