

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

130**CR-9482-2025****Date of decision: 12.01.2026****Amit Manchanda and another**

. . . . Petitioners

Vs.**Sanjeev Kumar**

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Govind Arora, Advocate, for the petitioners.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

Petitioners have approached this Court assailing the order dated 23.09.2025 passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Chandigarh, whereby two civil suits involving the same parties and the same subject matter were directed to be consolidated and further proceedings were ordered to be recorded in one of the cases.

2. The factual matrix is not in dispute. Civil Suit No. CS-943-2019 was instituted by Sanjeev Kumar (respondent herein) against Amit Manchanda and Rahul Manchanda (petitioners herein) seeking a decree for possession by way of specific performance in respect of the suit property. On the other hand, Civil Suit No. CS-909-2019 was filed by the petitioners against the respondent seeking relief of mandatory injunction, inter alia, restraining the respondent from interfering with their use of the same suit property and directing him to vacate the same.

3. Both the suits instituted in the year 2019 are between the same parties and relate to the same property pertain to overlapping issues of right, title and possession. Taking note of these undisputed facts, the learned trial Court ordered consolidation of both the suits to avoid conflicting findings and to ensure effective adjudication.

4. The sole contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioners is that in the suit filed by the petitioners, the plaintiffs’ evidence had already been closed, whereas in the suit filed by the respondent, only part evidence had been led. It is urged that consolidation at this stage would cause prejudice to the petitioners.
5. This Court finds no merit in the aforesaid contention. It is well settled that the power to consolidate suits is inherent in the Court, traceable to Section 151 CPC, and is exercised to avoid multiplicity of proceedings, conflicting judgments, and unnecessary duplication of evidence. Consolidation does not alter the substantive rights of the parties, nor does it reopen concluded stages of the proceedings, unless specifically so directed.
6. The mere fact that evidence in one suit has progressed further than in the other does not, by itself, create any legal impediment to consolidation, particularly when the core controversy, parties, and subject matter are identical. On the contrary, consolidation in such circumstances subserves the larger interest of justice by enabling a comprehensive and harmonious adjudication.
7. The petitioners have failed to demonstrate any specific prejudice or jurisdictional error occasioned by the impugned order. The order consolidating the suits is a procedural order, passed in the sound exercise of judicial discretion, and does not suffer from any perversity or illegality warranting interference under supervisory jurisdiction.
8. Consequently, finding no merit in the present petition and no ground to interfere with the well-reasoned order dated 23.09.2025, the same is hereby dismissed.

12.01.2026
Vivek

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>No</i>