



CR-2012-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

(136-1)

CR-2012-2025

Date of decision: - 01.04.2025

Jagjiwan Jaggi

....Petitioner

Versus

Mukhtiar Kaur @ Kuldip Kaur

.....Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Jasinder Singh Sekhon, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravi Chadda, Advocate  
for the respondent.

\*\*\*\*

**VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**

1. Present civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the impugned order dated 15.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) passed by the Additional Civil Judge (Sr. Division), Dasuya, whereby the warrants of possession had been issued by the Rent Controller.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the present case, he would limit his prayer only to a direction to the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Court to decide the application for stay filed alongwith the appeal dated 20.11.2023, in a time bound manner. It is further submitted that the said application alongwith the appeal is listed for hearing on 19.04.2025.



CR-2012-2025

-2-

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent-landlord has submitted that the petitioner has purposely filed the present revision petition at the fag end when the warrants of possession have already been issued. It is however submitted that in case counsel for the petitioner comes to argue the said stay application or the main appeal, counsel for the respondent would also be prepared to argue the stay application/main appeal. It is prayed that the passing of the present order should not be construed as stay of the execution proceedings.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances and the limited prayer made on behalf of the petitioner, the present revision petition is disposed of with a request to the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Court to decide the application for stay filed alongwith the appeal dated 20.11.2023 by the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of one week from 19.04.2025.

5. All the counsel concerned appearing before the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Court, as undertaken before this Court, would be prepared to argue the application for stay as well as the main appeal on 19.04.2025 or at any other date as given by the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Court.

6. The passing of the present order should not be construed as stay of the execution proceedings.

**April 01, 2025**  
*naresh.k*

**( VIKAS BAHL )**  
**JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?  
Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No