

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

109

CWP No. 22309 of 2021

Date of Decision:- 08.08.2022

AMARJIT SINGH AND ANOTHER

....Petitioners

vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....Respondents

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present:- Mr. Vijay Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have been ordered to be evicted from the land in dispute in proceedings initiated under the Punjab Public Premises and Land (Eviction and Rent Recovery) Act, 1973. Appeal has also been dismissed. Admittedly, the land is Jumla Mushtarka Malkan.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the District Development and Panchayat Officer ordered eviction after the appellate Court had stayed pronouncement of judgment. This fact has been brought to the notice of the appellate Court but it has failed to take the same into consideration. Thus, the impugned orders deserve to be set aside.

Assuming that the order of the District Development and Panchayat Officer was in violation of a stay order, that by itself does not render it without jurisdiction. The appellate Court has examined the merits of the case and has not found any error in the impugned order. Even learned counsel for the petitioners has not pointed out any error therein.

In view of the above, the writ petition has no merit and is dismissed.

August 08, 2022

(SUDHIR MITTAL)

poonam

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No