



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

154

CWP-11875-2026

Date of Decision: 20.04.2026

SURINDER SINGH AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. M.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr. Vikas Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

Barrister Rubal Garg for respondents No.2 to 4

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to trial Court to decide their suit for adverse possession titled as '*Surinder Singh Vs. Gurbachan Kaur*' before adjudicating third party objections filed by them in the execution petition titled as '*Gagandeep Singh Vs. Paramjeet Singh*'. They are further praying that proceedings in the execution petition may be stayed.

2. As per petition, Paramjeet Singh handed over possession of suit property to petitioner No.1 in 2003. Petitioner No.2 i.e. wife of petitioner No.1 started residing in suit property after marriage in 2008. Gurbachan Kaur filed civil suit for declaration and possession of the suit property against Paramjeet Singh. The suit was filed in 2013 and came to



be decreed on 22.11.2023. The petitioners filed suit for adverse possession on 30.04.2025. Civil Court granted stay vide order dated 30.09.2025 in injunction suit filed by Paramjeet Singh regarding part of the suit property. Petitioners gained knowledge of execution proceedings in October' 2025. Bailiff report dated 17.10.2025 confirmed possession of petitioners. The decree holders filed execution petition titled as '*Gagandeep Singh Vs. Paramjeet Singh*'. The petitioners filed third party objection in execution proceedings.

3. Barrister Rubal Garg has filed Power of Attorney on behalf of respondents No.2 to 4. The same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Executing Court may be directed to adjourn the matter till the conclusion of their suit for adverse possession.

5. The matter is pending before Executing Court as well as Civil Court. Both the Courts are quite competent to take care of interest of parties. No interference of this Court is warranted.

6. Dismissed.

7. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

April 20, 2026
Deepak DPA

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