



CR No.2553 of 2025

S. No. 128

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

CR No.2553 of 2025

Date of Decision:29.04.2025

Harminder Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Ritika Rani

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Mohinder Singh Joshi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (Oral)

Plaintiff – Ritika Rani (*respondent herein*) filed a suit seeking decree of permanent injunction to restrain the defendant – Harminder Singh (*petitioner herein*) from interfering in her peaceful possession over the suit property or in raising of the boundary wall by her over the suit property as detailed and described in head-note of the plaint (Annexure P.5). She had claimed her right in the suit property on the basis of a registered transfer deed dated 14.02.2017 executed in her favour by her father – Baldev Kumar. The defendant resisted the suit on the ground that transfer deed was wrongly executed and that plaintiff was not owner in possession of the property in dispute.

2. Along with the suit, an application for temporary injunction under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC was moved by the plaintiff, which was accepted by the trial Court by way of the order dated 20.04.2018, whereby defendant-petitioner was restrained from interfering in the possession of the plaintiff and



CR No.2553 of 2025

further restrained from interfering in the usage of the said property by the plaintiff in any manner. Appeal filed by the defendant- petitioner against this order dated 20.04.2018 was dismissed by the Appellate Court by way of the impugned order dated 25.02.2025.

3. Assailing the afore-said orders by way of present revision, it is contended by learned counsel that respondent- plaintiff is not owner of the property in dispute and rather, it is the government, which is the owner and that under the garb of the order passed by the trial Court and upheld by the Appellate Court, the plaintiff shall take possession of the property in dispute. Learned counsel prays to modify the impugned order by directing both the parties to maintain status-quo.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court does not find merit in the petition.

5. As has been found by the trial Court that plaintiff relied upon transfer deed dated 14.02.2017 showing her title to the suit property. She also placed on record copy of another sale deed dated 02.06.2014 revealing that defendant was owner in possession of the separate property. The Courts below thus found a prima facie case in favour of the plaintiff and granted injunctory relief to the plaintiff after holding that in case injunctory relief is not granted, plaintiff is likely to suffer irreparable loss and will be put to more inconvenience.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to convince this Court about any illegality or perversity in the afore-said order passed by the trial Court which has been upheld by the Appellate Court. No merits. Dismissed.

April 29, 2025

renu

**(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE**

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