



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

(120)

CR-2709-2026

Date of Decision:-25.03.2026

Tasminder Singh @ Jasinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Joginder Singh and Others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Jasdeep Singh Gill, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Sanjiv Ghai, Advocate,  
Mr. Jaspal Singh Pannu, Advocate and  
Ms. Harleen Kaur, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravinder Singh Rawal, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for issuing directions to the Court of learned Additional District Judge, Jalandhar to consider and decide the application under Order XLI Rule 5 read with Section 151 CPC, seeking stay of the operation of the impugned judgment and decree dated 18.12.2025 (Annexure P-6) passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), NRI, Jalandhar, filed along with Civil Appeal bearing No. CA-68-2026, in a time-bound manner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No.1/plaintiff had filed a suit for declaration against the petitioner. It is contended that the petitioner had filed a written statement to the said suit,



however, the learned trial Court decreed the suit vide judgment and decree dated 18.12.2025. Aggrieved against the same, the petitioner has preferred an appeal before the learned Additional District Judge-VIII, Jalandhar, along with an application under Order XLI Rule 5 read with Section 151 CPC seeking stay of the operation of the impugned judgment and decree.

2.1 It is further submitted that notice in the said appeal was issued to respondent No.1, which has been received back with the report that the addressee was not found at the given address. Learned counsel submits that respondent No.1 is the plaintiff in the main suit and is residing at the same address, and therefore, the report of the process server appears to be incorrect. It is lastly contended that in case mutation is sanctioned in favour of respondent No.1, the very purpose of filing the appeal would be frustrated.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the paper-book.

4. Considering the limited nature of relief sought, issuance of notice to the respondent is dispensed with, as the same would only result in further delay in the proceedings.

5. In view of the averments made in the petition, the present revision petition is disposed of without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case. The learned Additional District Judge-VIII, Jalandhar is directed to decide the application under Order XLI Rule 5 read with Section 151 CPC expeditiously, upon appearance of the parties.



CR-2709-2026

2026:PHHC:047968

6. Till the decision of the said application, the operation of the impugned judgment and decree dated 18.12.2025 shall remain stayed.

7. The Registry is directed to forward a copy of this order to the learned Additional District Judge-VIII, Jalandhar for compliance, expeditiously.

**(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**25.03.2026***Shubham*

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned:- | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable:-        | Yes/No |