



368

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

CR-2732-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.07.2025

Rajinder Singh Cheema and another ...Petitioners

Versus

Santosh Kalra and others ...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present: Mr. R. Kartikeya, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate and  
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate and  
Ms. Sharvi Dadhwal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, AAG, Haryana, for respondent No.3.

\*\*\*\*

**VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**

1. This is a revision petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for quashing the impugned order dated 29.04.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Additional District Judge, Karnal.

2. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned counsel for respondent No.1 have jointly submitted that they have amicably settled the matter.

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 has submitted that respondent No.1 does not wish to use the premises in question for commercial purpose and has also submitted that an application before the Municipal Corporation, Karnal on 10.07.2025 for withdrawal of conversion granted in favour of respondent No.1 with respect to the property in question. It is submitted that in the said circumstances, respondent No.1 has no objection in case the impugned order dated 29.04.2025 (Annexure P-1) is set aside and status quo with respect to



property of respondent No.1 is maintained till the decision of the suit. It is further submitted that respondent No.1 would also make statement before the trial Court in favour of the petitioners for decreeing the suit of the petitioners.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in view of the fair stand taken on behalf of respondent No.1, the present revision petition be disposed of and status quo order be passed with respect to the property of respondent No.1.

5. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances and the fair stand taken on behalf of the petitioners as well as respondent No.1, the present revision petition is allowed and order dated 29.04.2025 is set aside with the following observations/directions:-

- i) Respondent No.1 would maintain status quo with respect to the property in question till the time the civil suit is decided.
- ii) It would be open to respondent No.1 to make statement before the trial Court admitting the claim of the petitioners and for decreeing the suit of the petitioners.
- iii) It would be open to respondent No.1 to pursue her application for recalling the CLU granted in favour of respondent No.1 which would be considered by the Municipal Corporation-respondent No.2 in accordance with law.

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

**22.07.2025**

*Pawan*

**(VIKAS BAHL)  
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No**

**Whether reportable:- Yes/No**