



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

130

CR-5809-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 01.09.2025

Amritpal Singh and another

...Petitioners

V/s

Ranjit Singh and others

...Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL**

Present: Mr. Aashish Chopra, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate, and  
Mr. Abhinav Kaushik, Advocate, for the petitioners.  
  
Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, Advocate and  
Mr. Anmol Rattan S. Dhillon, Advocate,  
for the caveator-respondent.

\*\*\*

**VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)**

Challenge in the instant revision petition, preferred under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, is to orders dated 17.03.2025 (Annexure P-1) and dated 28.07.2025 (Annexure P-1/A) passed by the Court of Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Ludhiana.

2. Shorn of unnecessary details, the facts, as emerging from the revision petition, are that a suit for mandatory injunction (Annexure P-8) was instituted by the petitioners-plaintiffs against the respondents-defendants seeking return of entire advance amount of Rs.1.5 crores, received by the respondents-defendants under two agreements to sell dated 21.03.2008, executed between the parties, along with interest @ 12% per annum from the date of filing of the suit till its realization. Consequential relief of permanent injunction restraining defendant No.5 not to release the amount of compensation to the respondents-defendants No.1 to 4 was also sought.

3. Subsequently, on an application under Order 7 Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (for short the "CPC") having been filed, the



petitioners-plaintiffs were called upon to deposit the Court fee for treating the suit to be a suit for recovery, which was duly deposited.

4. An application under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC and another application under Order 38 Rule 5 CPC was filed by the petitioners-plaintiffs. Both applications came to be dismissed vide order dated 17.03.2025. Whereafter, a review petition as regards decision on the application under Order 38 Rule 5 CPC was filed, which has also now been dismissed vide order dated 28.07.2025.

5. Learned Senior Counsel representing the petitioners-plaintiffs submits that the respondents-defendants had undertaken not to withdraw the amount of compensation awarded to them on account of acquisition of a part of the land. He submits that to protect the rights and interests of the petitioners-plaintiffs, the said undertaking be ordered to continue.

6. The submissions made by learned Senior Counsel representing the petitioners-plaintiffs have been opposed by learned Senior Counsel representing the respondents-defendants.

7. During the course of arguments, a consensus has been arrived at. Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, learned counsel assisting learned Senior Counsel representing the respondents-defendants, on instructions, submits that with a view to protect the rights and interests of the petitioners-plaintiffs, the respondents-defendants shall furnish adequate security for a sum of Rs.2 crores to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

8. Mr. Nakul Sharma, learned counsel assisting learned Senior Counsel representing the petitioners-plaintiffs, on instructions, is agreeable to the same.

9. That being so, the present revision petition is disposed of in the above terms. The respondents-defendants shall now furnish adequate security



for a sum of Rs.2 crores before the trial Court to its satisfaction, within a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

10. The aforesaid arrangement shall, however, be an interim arrangement, without prejudice to the rights of the parties in the suit.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**September 01, 2025**

vcgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No