



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

123

CR No. 5158 of 2025

DATE OF DECISION :- 04.08.2025

Aryan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Manjit Singh and another

...Respondents

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

**Present:-** Mr. Jagtar Kureel, Advocate with  
Mr. Neeraj Sansaniwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)**

1. Revisionist has filed this Revision Petition against the impugned order dated 12.01.2024 vide which the learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Kharar has dismissed the application under Order 1 Rule 10 of CPC filed by the revisionist.
2. Revisionist alleges himself to be the owner of the property and he is aggrieved by the order dated 13.03.2023 passed in an application under Order 39 Rule 1 & 2 of CPC vide which the learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Kharar in para No. 27 of the order has directed that status quo qua the transfer of above mentioned property by way of alienation, mortgaging or creating charge till further orders be maintained and the counsel for the revisionist contended that this order has been reflected in the revenue record so he is not allowed to sell the property. It is settled principle of law that the injunction order, if any, passed is binding upon the parties to that litigation and the revisionist is not a party to the litigation in the Court of Civil Judge



**CR No. 5158 of 2025**                      **2**

(Jr. Divn.), Kharar and counsel for the revisionist contends that the revisionist would be satisfied in case it is made clear that the order would be binding upon the parties to the litigation.

3.                      So, the Revision Petition stands disposed of with observation that the order passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Kharar would be binding upon the parties to the litigation.

**(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**04.08.2025**

*P.Singh*

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No