



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

1. CWP No.22032 of 2024  
Date of Decision: 04.09.2024

Sanjeev Kumar & Others  
...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & Others  
...Respondents

2. CWP No.22062 of 2024

Joga Singh & Another  
...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & Others  
...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, Advocate and  
Mr. Nipun Bhardwaj, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional AG, Haryana with  
Mr. Saurabh Mago, DAG, Haryana.

\* \* \* \*

G.S. SANDHAWALIA J. (Oral)

Prayer made in both these present writ petitions, filed under  
Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the  
nature of mandamus directing the official respondents to not dispossess the  
petitioners from the land in question falling in Village Faral, Tehsil and  
District Kaithal measuring 117 kanal 14 marla comprised in Khewat  
No.2192//2011, Khatoni No.2520, Khasra No.137, Killa No.22/3, 23/2,



Khasra Nos.849, 850, 851, 852, during the pendency of the statutory Revision Petition(s) before respondent No.2-Commissioner, Karnal.

2. It is submitted that despite the pendency of the proceedings in the Revision Petition(s) along-with the application for stay, the warrants of possession have been issued vide Notice dated 24.06.2024 (Annexure P-4) by the District Development and Panchayat Officer-cum-Assistant Collector Ist Grade, Kaithal. It is further submitted that the petitioners have constructed their houses on the land in question and the Revision Petitions would be rendered infructuous if during the pendency of the same, the eviction order dated 12.10.2023 which is the subject matter of challenge in the revision petition and upheld by respondent No.3-Collector, Kaithal on 12.04.2024 is implemented.

3. Counsel for the State puts in appearance and pointed out that the revision petitions are pending for 25.09.2024.

4. Keeping in view the above, we do not propose to issue notice to respondents No.6 and 7 as the proceedings will be further delayed unnecessarily and no useful purpose will be served, as conditional relief is to be granted.

5. Resultantly, we disposed of these writ petitions with directions to respondent No.2-Commissioner, Karnal/Revisional Authority to dispose of the Revision Petition(s) and decide the same within a period of three months by passing a speaking order. It is made clear that till there is a final decision passed in the Revision Petition(s) filed by the petitioners, the possession of the petitioners shall remain protected. Needless to say that



the outer limit fixed by this Court is flexible and if it is possible for the Revisional Authority to decide the matter earlier, it would be open to do so.

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)  
JUDGE

September 04, 2024  
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)  
JUDGE

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