

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

CR-3209-2025

Date of decision: 09.09.2025

Ramu @ Rampal Siradhna and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Smt. Devki Devi

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Pradeep Chhoker, Advocate for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

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

1. Petitioners herein are the defendants before the Court of Ld. Civil Judge (Junior Division), Rewari in Civil Suit No.265-2024 titled as Smt. Devki Devi Vs. Ramu and another.
2. Petitioners are aggrieved by the order dated 19.12.2024 (Annexure P-3), whereby their application under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC for rejection of the plaint has been declined by the trial Court.
3. Perusal of the plaint (Annexure P-1) would reveal that it was pleaded by the plaintiff he had purchased a plot measuring 91 sq yards out of the land detailed in para no.1 of the plaint, by virtue of a sale deed dated 24.03.1995, regarding which a mutation dated 27.08.1996 was sanctioned. Alleging that defendants did not have any concern with the suit property and were interfering in possession, prayer for passing a decree of permanent injunction was made.
4. It is contended by learned counsel that, the property in dispute was acquired by HUDA, with which the plaintiff has no concern.
5. After considering the contentions raised by learned counsel, this Court does not find any merit in the contentions.
6. In case, the land regarding which the plaintiff is claiming



injunction, belongs to the Government having been acquired, defendants can put forth their claim before the trial Court in their written statement. At the time of considering the application under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC, the Court is only required to look into the pleadings of the plaintiff and the cause of action alleged therein. There is nothing in the pleading of the plaintiff suggesting that the land was ever acquired.

7. In these circumstances, this Court does not find any illegality or perversity in the impugned order calling for invoking the revisional jurisdiction of this Court.

8. Accordingly, the present revision petition is dismissed.

**09.09.2025**

*Yogesh*

**(DEEPAK GUPTA)  
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned:-  
Whether reportable:-**

**Yes/No  
Yes/No**