



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

202

RSA-2281-1995 (O&M)

Date of Decision:13.11.2025

State of Punjab through Collector, Ludhiana

.....Appellant

Vs.

Mukhtiar Singh and Another

.....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Ishaan Kaushal, AAG, Punjab for the appellant.

Mr. Gurcharan Dass, Advocate for respondent No.1.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Compliance of the order dated 14.05.2024 has not been made by the appellant-State of Punjab, despite the fact that it was made clear on the last date of hearing that in case, needful is not done, the consequences shall follow.

2. Apart from the aforesaid failure on the part of the appellant, it is noticed that plaintiff Mukhtiar Singh had filed a civil suit simplicitor for seeking a decree of permanent injunction to restrain the defendants from interfering in his possession over the suit land. By way of judgment dated 09.01.1990, the trial Court decreed the suit, whereby defendant No.2 i.e. State of Punjab was restrained from interfering in the possession of the plaintiff over the suit land or to dispossess him forcibly except in due course of law. Meaning thereby, the State of Punjab was given the right to dispossess the plaintiff but only in due course of law. The appeal

filed by State of Punjab was dismissed by the first Appellate Court on 07.10.1994, affirming the findings of the trial Court.

3. It is the aforesaid concurrent findings, which were assailed by State of Punjab. Despite opportunities, the appellant has failed to serve respondent No.2. Even otherwise, as has already been noted above, the only relief granted to the plaintiff is not to dispossess him forcibly.

4. In the aforesaid circumstances, no further ground is made out to adjourn the matter.

The appeal stands dismissed, as there is no reason to interfere.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

November 13, 2025
Neetika Tuteja

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