

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BANGLADESH
HIGH COURT DIVISION
(CIVIL REVISIONAL JURISDICTION)**

Present:

Mr. Justice Zafar Ahmed

Civil Revision No. 1980 of 2020

In the matter of:

Rayhan alias Rayhan Uddin and others

Defendant-respondent-petitioners

-Versus-

Hajera Khatun and others

Plaintiff-appellant-opposite parties

Mr. Shah Amran, Advocate

...For the petitioners

Mr. A.T.M. Mizanur Rahman, Advocate

... For the opposite party Nos. 1-7

Heard on: 12.01.2026

Judgment on: 25.01.2026

The instant Rule arises out of the judgment and order dated 11.11.2020 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, 3rd Court, Kishoregonj in Miscellaneous Appeal No. 12 of 2020 allowing the appeal and reversing the judgment and order dated 15.01.2020 passed by the learned Senior Assistant Judge, Karimganj, Kishoregonj in Other Class Suit No. 317 of 2019.

At the time of issuance of the Rule, this Court on 06.12.2020 passed an ad-interim order staying operation of the judgment and

order dated 11.11.2020 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, 3rd Court, Kishoregonj in Miscellaneous Appeal No. 12 of 2020 and directed the parties to maintain *status quo* in respect of possession of the suit land for a period of 04 months.

The present opposite party Nos. 1-7 as plaintiffs filed the Other Class Suit No. 317 of 2019 for permanent injunction in the trial Court. During the pendency of the suit, the plaintiffs filed an application under Order 39, rule 1/2 for temporary injunction which was rejected on contest by the trial Court. The appellate Court below allowed the prayer for temporary injunction on contest whereby the defendants were restrained from entering into the suit land without due course of law and from disturbing the peaceful possession of the plaintiffs till disposal of the suit. Challenging the same, the defendants filed the instant revisional application, obtained the Rule, order of stay and *status quo*.

Mr. A.T.M. Mizanur Rahman, learned Advocate appearing for the opposite party Nos. 1-7 have filed counter-affidavit.

Heard the learned Advocates of both sides and perused the materials on record.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the order *status quo* passed by this Court at the time of issuance of the Rule, if continues till disposal of the suit, will serve

justice. Accordingly, the parties are directed to maintain *status quo* in respect of possession of the suit land till disposal of the suit.

With the above observations and directions, the Rule is disposed of.