



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No.1836 of 2024 (O&M)

Date of Order:20.05.2025

Rati Ram

.Petitioner

Versus

Bijender Singh and others

..Respondents

COCP No.4691 of 2024(O&M)

Rati Ram

.Petitioner

Versus

Bijender Singh and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. R.A.Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner.

None for the respondents.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, JUDGE (Oral)

1. With the consent of the learned counsel representing the petitioner, two connected cases, namely, Civil Revision No.1836 of 2024 and COCP No.4691 of 2024, shall stand disposed of by this common order.

2. The plaintiff assails the correctness of the concurrent orders passed by the courts below while dismissing his application for grant of temporary injunction. Admittedly, the parties are co-sharers in the joint land. Moreover, both the courts have held that the plaintiff failed to produce any material to prove his exclusive possession over the suit property which is a part of joint khewat.

3. The learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that inadvertently copies of khasra girdwaries were not produced before the trial



court but the same have been produced before this court.

4. This court has considered the submissions of the learned counsel representing the petitioner.

5. This court is exercising revisional jurisdiction against the impugned orders passed by the trial court in which appeal has been affirmed by the appellate court. It will not be appropriate to take into consideration the new documents which were not produced before the courts below.

6. In COCP, the learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that despite interim order of status quo with respect to possession passed by the Court on 21.03.2024, the respondents have harvested the crop.

7. Thus, it is evident that the petitioner is not in the exclusive possession of the property.

8. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and discussion, no ground to interfere with the concurrent orders passed by the courts below, is made out.

9. Consequently, the revision petition as well as COCP are dismissed.

10. Needless to observe that the trial court will independently decide the suit uninfluenced by the observations made in the impugned orders or by this court.

11. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

May 20, 2025

nt

Whether speaking/reasoned : **Yes/No**
Whether reportable : **Yes/No**