



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

129

CR No. 7071 of 2025

DATE OF DECISION :- 30.09.2025

Parwinder Singh**...Petitioner****Versus****Manjit Singh****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL**

Present:- Mr. Rahul Vohra, Advocate with
Ms. Sonali Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The civil revision is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India assailing the order dated 23.09.2025 passed by Executing Court, Chandigarh whereby the objection petition filed by the petitioner has been dismissed.
2. The facts leading to the filing of objection petition are that Rent Controller, Chandigarh ordered ejection of petitioner-tenant from the disputed premises and the landlord filed execution petition for seeking possession of the disputed premises. An appeal was preferred by the petitioner-tenant which was entertained and the execution of the order passed by Rent Controller was stayed. Later on appeal was dismissed for want of prosecution. Petitioner-tenant filed an application for revival of the appeal which was pending. During that period execution petition was filed by the landlord-respondent and petitioner filed objection petition which was dismissed vide impugned order.



3. The order passed by the learned Executing Court has been assailed on the grounds that the order is against law and facts and is not sustainable.

4. Perusal of the impugned order shows that the learned Executing Court has dealt with all the objections submitted by the petitioner. As regards pendency of application for restoration of the appeal is concerned the learned Executing Court has recorded that mere pendency of restoration application does not bar the Executing Court from executing the judgment and decree. As regards the suit land being agricultural land and that Rent Petition is not maintainable the Executing Court has recorded a finding that the same objection was taken in the main petition and was rejected and Executing Court cannot go behind the decree. Third objection with regard to Chandigarh Administration having acquired the property is concerned, the learned Executing Court has rightly observed that dispute between the U.T. Administration and the decree holder is not subject matter of this lis and the Executing Court is to execute the decree as it is before the Court. As regards description of suit property is concerned the learned Executing Court has held that decree holder has placed on record a site plan specifically showing 2/3rd area in possession of the JD and that ejection order was passed on two grounds i.e. non-payment of rent and on the grounds of personal necessity, so mere payment of arrears of rent would not be sufficient to stall the execution of the decree.

5. Vide this revision petition, the petitioner has assailed the impugned order on its merits whereas the scope of revision petition is not to go into the merits of adjudication rather in revisional jurisdiction the Court has to see as to if the Court below has not exercised the jurisdiction vested in



CR No. 7071 of 2025

3

it or has exercised jurisdiction which is not vested in the Court concerned or there is any material illegality in the exercise of jurisdiction but after going through the impugned order this Court does not find any ground to interfere in the revisional jurisdiction. As such, the revision petition stands dismissed.

**(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE**

30.09.2025

P.Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No