



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

\*\*\*\*

279

**CR-3240-2022**

**Date of Decision.:22.04.2025**

**Gurmukh Singh**

**Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**The Kalgidhar Trust Registered Gurudwara  
Barru Sahib**

**Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA**

Present: Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate and  
Mr. Rahul, Advocate for  
the petitioner.

Mr. Ranjit Singh Sidhu, Advocate  
for the respondent.

\*\*\*\*

**DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)**

Petitioner is the defendant before trial Court in civil suit titled as 'The Kalgidhar Trust Registered Gurdawara Barru Sahib v. Gurmukh Singh'. He moved an application under Order XXVI Rule 9 CPC for appointing a revenue official as Local Commissioner so as to demarcate the property in dispute. The application was dismissed by way of the impugned order dated 20.05.2022, which has been assailed by the petitioner before this Court.

Learned counsel contends that demarcating the property in dispute shall resolve the controversy between the parties. However learned counsel for the respondent has rightly pointed out that defendant i.e. petitioner herein has laid his claim by filing a counter-claim on the basis of an earlier demarcation report dated 20.10.2020. It is conceded by learned

**CR-3240-2022****-2-**

counsel for the petitioner that demarcation report dated 20.10.2020 as relied by the petitioner- defendant was also prepared by a revenue official.

In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court does not find any illegality or perversity in the impugned order, declining the application for appointing a Local Commissioner.

Dismissed.

**( DEEPAK GUPTA )**  
**JUDGE**

**April 22, 2025**

Neetika Tuteja

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No