



CR-4626-2025 (O&amp;M)

-1-

121

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

**CR-4626-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 22.07.2025**

Kulwinder Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Gurpreet Singh and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**

Present : Mr. P.K.S.Phoolka, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (ORAL)**

1. Challenge in this petition is for setting aside the impugned order dated 04.04.2025 passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Bathinda, whereby application filed by the petitioners for providing police assistance for demarcation of the suit property, has been rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Bathinda, vide its order dated 04.04.2025, has wrongly dismissed the application of the petitioners for providing police assistance for demarcation of the suit property as per the report/demand letter dated 01.10.2024 received from the Field Kanungo. He further contends that on 16.04.2024, the application for the appointment of a Local Commissioner was allowed and the Field Kanungo was directed to carry out the necessary demarcation of the suit property. Hence, once the



CR-4626-2025 (O&M)

-2-

demarcation was allowed, the application for police assistance for demarcation of the suit property should not have been dismissed.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the impugned order dated 04.04.2025 passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Bathinda.

4. The relevant portion of the said impugned order is reproduced as under:-

“XXX XXX XXX XXX.

2. *I have heard the arguments and perused the records. Before considering the present application, it is important to discuss here that on 16.04.2024, the application for the appointment of a Local Commissioner was allowed, and the Field Kanungo was directed to carry out the necessary demarcation of the suit property. However, the demarcation was not conducted due to the obstruction, therefore vide order dated 10.10.2024, the court decided to address the stay application instead of proceeding with further demarcation, as such action would delay the adjudication of the case. Accordingly, on 08.11.2024, the arguments on the stay application were heard, and both the parties were directed to maintain the status quo until the matter is fully adjudicated.*

3. *In light of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, I find that a further demarcation is not essential at this stage for the resolution of the present case. The need for police assistance to conduct the demarcation is therefore unnecessary, and no direction*



CR-4626-2025 (O&amp;M)

-3-

*can be issued to the police authorities in this regard. The matter will be decided based on the merits of the case after the parties present their evidence. Accordingly, the present application is dismissed and disposed of. The case is adjourned to 21.05.2025 for the evidence of the plaintiffs ”*

5. A perusal of the above shows that the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Bathinda, has rightly held that further demarcation is not essential and therefore, police assistance to conduct the demarcation is unnecessary.

6. In view of the above, I do not find any illegality or infirmity in the impugned order dated 04.04.2025 passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Bathinda, and the same is hereby upheld. Accordingly, the present petition is hereby **dismissed**.

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

**(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)**  
**JUDGE**

22.07.2025

Virender

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes

Whether reportable : Yes/No