



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

214

**CWP-11044-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.09.2025**

KIRAN BALA

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate with
Mr. Anuj Mahla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen S. Panwar, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Ajay Kumar Kansal, Advocate with
Ms. Garima Kansal, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

Kuldeep Tiwari, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is daughter-in-law of respondent No.3, having grievance from the impugned order dated 29.03.2023 (Annexure P-2) passed by the Collector-cum-President, Senior Citizen Maintenance Authority, Panipat, has sought quashing of the order (supra).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner at the outset submits that civil dispute qua the property is already pending before the Civil Court concerned.

3. Respondent No.3 has provided for the suit for declaration to the effect that she is in possession of 100 square yards, out of total 200 square yards. He further submits that the said plot being co-shared property, an appeal was preferred before the Human Rights Commission, however, there, the matter was compromised to the effect that the petitioner, and respondent No.3, will share a possession of 100 square yards each on the said plot in dispute (200 square yards).

**CWP-11044-2023 (O&M)**

4. He further submits that on the basis of the compromise, the factum of the compromise was considered by the Civil Court concerned, and the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 22.05.2023, parties were directed to maintain status quo regarding suit property.

5. He further submits that the petitioner has never intended to claim more than 100 square yards upon the property in question, and therefore, instant petition may be disposed of with the observation that both the parties will maintain status quo till the final decision of the civil suit preferred by respondent No.3.

6. He further submits that the submissions made by respondent No.1, though factually is not opposed, counsel for respondent No.3, however, submits that so far as the compromise of the parties is concerned, he has no instructions in this regard. In view of the above, this Court is of the considered view that since respondent No.3 has already preferred a civil suit which is pending consideration, therefore, the order of eviction may not be given effect.

7. Instant petition is **disposed of** with the observation that both the parties shall maintain status quo upon the suit property in the question. Both the parties are at liberty to establish their respective claim before the Civil Courts concerned.

8. Ordered, accordingly.

9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

08.09.2025
harpreet

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No