

Ravinder Singh

....Petitioner

VS

Financial Commissioner (Appeals) and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate for the petitioner

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner had filed objections to the *Naksha Be* which came to be rejected. Appeal was also dismissed and, thus, revision petition was filed in which stay of dispossession has been declined vide order dated 14.07.2021.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that meanwhile, *sanad* has been issued and issuance of warrants of possession has been ordered. In case possession is transferred, the revision petition would be rendered infructuous. Another application for stay of dispossession has also been filed but the same has not been entertained.

Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 3 only.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3 and waives service.

Considering the nature of the order being passed, there is no necessity to file reply.

The writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the concerned Financial Commissioner to entertain the application, copy Annexure P-10 and to decide the same by passing a speaking order. Meanwhile, parties are directed to maintain status quo regarding possession.

16.11.2022

reena

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE