



learned Executing Court, whereby the objections preferred by the respondents to the execution petition were dismissed.

BRIEF FACTS

2. The petitioner had filed a rent petition under Section 13 of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949, on 09.04.2008 against one Rajiv Bhatia seeking ejectment of the tenant from the demised premises. The Rent Controller allowed the petition on 13.09.2011.

3. Thereafter, an execution petition was filed on 15.06.2012 before the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Amritsar. During execution, respondents No. 1 and 2 and respondent No. 3 filed separate objections. Despite dismissal of objections, the respondents preferred their respective appeals, CMA No. 47 of 2023 and CA No. 101 of 2023, on 22.03.2023 before the learned Additional District Judge, Amritsar, against the order dated 16.02.2023. These appeals are still pending.

4. It is contended that the execution petition has remained pending since 15.06.2012 without any interim stay, solely due to frivolous objections and dilatory tactics adopted by the respondents. The prolonged pendency has deprived the petitioner of the fruits of the ejectment order for nearly fourteen years.

5. It is further urged that even earlier, attempts by the respondents to stall execution had been rejected, yet the matter has not reached finality due to repeated objections and successive appeals.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record with his assistance.

7. It is evident that the rent petition was instituted in the year 2008 and allowed on 13.09.2011. The execution petition, filed on 15.06.2012, has remained



CR-5405-2025 (O&M)

-3-

undecided till date. The protracted pendency is primarily on account of repeated and untenable objections by the respondents.

8. It is a settled principle that once a decree has attained finality, the decree-holder is entitled to its fruits without unreasonable delay. The Supreme Court, in *Ramrameshwari Devi v. Nirmala Devi, (2011) 8 SCC 249*, and *Salem Advocate Bar Association, Tamil Nadu v. Union of India, (2005) 6 SCC 344*, has emphasised that procedural delays must be curtailed and courts should adopt a proactive approach in ensuring that trials proceed without undue adjournments, particularly when parties are of advanced age.

9. In the present case, continued pendency of appeals arising from dismissal of execution objections is prolonging the matter beyond reasonable limits.

10. Accordingly, the learned Additional District Judge, Amritsar, is requested to dispose of CMA No. 47 of 2023 and CA No. 101 of 2023, arising from the order dated 16.02.2023 passed by the Executing Court, as expeditiously as possible without granting unnecessary adjournments to either party.

11. With the above observations and directions, both the above-numbered civil revision petitions stand disposed of.

12. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed off.

August 13, 2025
tripti

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Speaking
Whether reportable : Yes/No