



CR-6432-2025 (O&M)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-6432-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: September 12, 2025

Swaranjit Singh and othersPetitioners

Vs.

Ranjodh Singh and ors.Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Dr. Ram Kumar Singla, Advocate and
Ms. Meenu Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been preferred by the petitioners against order dated 04.04.2025 passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Fatehgarh Sahib, whereby the application filed by the respondents/plaintiffs in respect of the lease/rent amount of the suit land to be paid by the respondents/plaintiffs, has been allowed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the respondents have filed the application just to create evidence to show that they are tenants whereas the respondents are not tenants and they are strangers to the property in question. He, therefore contends that the learned Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Fatehgarh Sahib has wrongly allowed the application moved by the respondents/plaintiffs without taking into consideration the reply filed by the petitioners.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the whole file of this case with his able assistance.

4. A perusal of the impugned order shows that learned Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Fatehgarh Sahib has rightly held that the respondents/plaintiffs are

**CR-6432-2025 (O&M)**

allowed to tender rent and deposit the same in the Court, as per rate of rent alleged by them and the order shall have no bearing on the merits of the case and cannot be used to show the possession or tenancy of the plaintiffs over the property in question. It has further been rightly held that the rate of rent, the period of alleged tenancy and the tenancy itself is nowhere established by the permission given in the order and the order cannot be used before any court of competent jurisdiction (civil, criminal or revenue) to show the possession/tenancy of the plaintiffs over the property in question or the assertion of rate of rent or to establish the alleged tenure of the alleged tenancy. Further that deposit of any amount with the Court would not in any manner lead to inference qua the tenancy or the possession, rate of rent or tenure of rent in favour of the respondents/plaintiffs.

5. In view of the above, I do not find any infirmity or illegality in the order dated 04.04.2025 passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Fatehgarh Sahib.

6. The civil revision petition is dismissed being devoid of any merits.

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

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

September 12, 2025

Gaurav Arora

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No