

2025:PHHC:131907



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

**CR-1589-2020(O&M)**

**Date of decision: September 19, 2025**

Amarjit Singh through his LRs

...Petitioner

Versus

Ranvir Singh and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ARCHANA PURI**

Present: Mr.Chanakya Batta, Advocates  
for the petitioner.

Mr.Aashish Aggarwal, Senior Advocate with  
Mr.Saket Bhandari, Advocate  
for respondent No.1.

\*\*\*\*

**ARCHANA PURI, J.**

At this stage, learned counsel for respondent No.1, before advertng to the application filed for seeking vacation of stay order passed by this Court, has brought to the notice of the Court that at the inception stage, on 04.03.2020, this Court had issued notice to respondent No.1, only for the limited extent for exploring the possibility of compromise between the parties.

On perusal of the order dated 04.03.2020, a query was put by the Court to learned counsel for the petitioner about the arrival of compromise, if any, or any such talk having taken place, but he was unable to state about

any such efforts made, in consonance with the aforesaid order passed by this Court. In fact, he submits that the Court may, of its own, pass any order, in this revision petition.

Considering the submission aforesaid made by counsel for the petitioner, it should not be appropriate to proceed further with the revision petition, as in a way, counsel for the petitioner has given his mind not to pursue the revision petition. But anyhow, since this Court, of its own, can summon the record of the trial Court and pass an appropriate order, therefore, considering the same, it shall be appropriate to consider, under what circumstances, the instant revision petition has been filed.

As culled out from the paperbook, the revision petition has been filed by the LRs of deceased Amarjit Singh, namely, Jasvir Kaur and Jatinder Kumar, to assail the order of dismissal of the objections, filed at their instance, in the execution petition No.105 of 2017. Copy of the judgment and decree under execution has been placed on record as Annexure P-1. Perusal of the same reveals that Ranvir Singh s/o Gurdial Singh had filed a suit for seeking possession of Evacue property No.181, as detailed in the headnote of the plaint. Bachni, widow of Piara Singh and children of Piara Singh were impleaded as defendants in the said suit. On appraisal of the evidence, brought on record, the said suit was decreed vide judgment dated 25.08.2012. Thereupon, execution was filed.

During the pendency of the execution petition, objections were filed, at the behest of LRs of Amarjit Singh, in the execution petition. It is pertinent to mention that in the civil suit Annexure P-1, Amarjit Singh s/o Piara Singh was impleaded defendant No.5 and both the objectors i.e. Jasvir

Kaur and Jatinder Kumar are widow and son of deceased Amarjit Singh.

Perusal of the order dated 30.01.2020 reveals that the objections have been very meticulously appraised by learned Executing Court. In fact, considering the judgment and decree as well as taking into consideration the objections filed, it is pertinent to mention that the predecessor of the objectors had asserted about being owners of the suit property, though, there was no such material brought on record, relating to their ownership. In fact, as observed in the judgment and decree, learned trial Court had also taken into consideration the volume of litigation, initiated at the instance of Amarjit Singh, predecessor of the objectors.

In fact, it was also categorically held that the objectors have only stepped into the shoes of JD-Amarjit Singh and therefore, their rights are very limited i.e. to the extent of rights of Amarjit Singh only. After the decretal of the suit, the rights, as such, were also adjudicated by the trial Court, as evident from the impugned order. There is nothing, as such, coming on record, on what basis Amarjit Singh was asserted to be the owner of the suit property. Volume of litigation was initiated at the instance of Amarjit Singh, which has been detailed in paragraph No.6 of the impugned order. However, the entire litigation was decided against Amarjit Singh.

Considering the same and also on account of no material, coming on record, with regard to Amarjit Singh, predecessor of interest, having a right better than the right of decree holder Ranvir Singh, in whose favour, the sale deed was executed by Nasib Chand, who was allottee of Evacue property, the Executing Court had correctly appraised the material and dismissed the objections.

The impugned order, as such, warrants no interference. Hence, the revision petition sans merit and the same is hereby dismissed.

September 19, 2025  
Vgulati

(ARCHANA PURI)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes  
Yes/No