



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

(255)

CR-3551-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-15.09.2025

Satvir Singh Hooda and Another

... Petitioners

Versus

Mukant Tanwar

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Vivek Suri, Advocate with
Mr. Dushyant Godara, Advocate
for the petitioners.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners, by invoking the supervisory jurisdiction of this Court conferred under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, have laid challenge to the order dated 20.03.2025 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Rohtak, whereby the order dated 13.11.2024 rendered by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Rohtak, has been upheld. It is the grievance of the petitioners that both the Courts below have failed to exercise jurisdiction vested in them in a just and judicious manner, thereby necessitating interference by this Court in the exercise of its supervisory powers to ensure that the subordinate Courts have acted within the parameters of law and have not committed any manifest error resulting in grave miscarriage of justice.
2. Briefly adverting to the factual matrix of the case, the petitioners instituted a civil suit seeking a decree of declaration along with



consequential relief of permanent injunction, asserting their ownership and possession over the suit property on the premise that the acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 had lapsed by efflux of time and operation of law. During the pendency of the said suit, the defendants moved an application invoking the inherent powers of the Court under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (hereinafter referred to as “CPC”) as well as under Order XIV Rule 1 CPC, praying for disposal of the lis on a pure question of law. The said application came to be allowed by the learned trial Court vide order dated 19.09.2017, the operative part whereof reads as under:-

xxxx

“Therefore, as a sequel to above said discussion, the application of the applicant is allowed, however, as per direction given by the Hon'ble High Court in para no. 38 of the said judgment, petitioner is directed to maintain status quo of the suit property and he is restrained from changing the nature of property as well as creating right of third person in said property for a period of one year so that in meanwhile State can, if such property is required for public purpose, again acquire it.”

2.1 Subsequent thereto, the petitioners, by making a voluntary statement before the Court, withdrew the suit, which accordingly came to be dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 20.09.2017. Thereafter, alleging deliberate and willful disobedience on the part of the respondents, the petitioners instituted an application under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 seeking initiation of contempt proceedings. The learned Civil Judge, however, vide order dated 13.11.2024, dismissed the said application while holding that no binding adjudication or operative decree



had been rendered in the suit, which was simply dismissed as withdrawn at the behest of the plaintiffs themselves. It was further observed that any interim order passed during the pendency of the suit stood merged in, and eclipsed by, the final order of withdrawal, thereby ceasing to have any legal efficacy thereafter. It was also noted that the contempt application had been premised upon the notice dated 07.11.2024 issued by the respondents, which was subsequent to, and *de-hors*, the dismissal of the main suit as withdrawn.

3. The appeal instituted by the petitioners was dismissed by the learned Additional District Judge vide the impugned order. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioners have approached this Court by way of the present revision petition, invoking its supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

4. Even if, for the sake of argument, it is assumed that the interim order dated 19.07.2017 continued to remain operative notwithstanding the subsequent dismissal of the suit as withdrawn, the scope and effect of the said order would still stand confined only to the petitioners. By virtue of the interim order, it was the petitioners alone who were directed to maintain status quo with regard to the suit property and were specifically restrained from altering the nature of the property or from creating any third-party rights therein for a period of one year. The order did not impose any restraint or obligation upon the respondents. Consequently, there was no injunctive relief operating against the respondents which they could have disobeyed, and as such, no violation on their part could be alleged within the meaning of contempt.



5. Having given thoughtful consideration to the totality of facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that both the Courts below have acted well within the bounds of law and committed neither illegality nor material irregularity in declining to exercise the jurisdiction vested in them. Accordingly, the present revision petition, being devoid of merit, stands dismissed. Nevertheless, it is clarified that nothing contained in this order shall preclude the petitioners from availing such remedies as may otherwise be available to them in law against the order sought to be enforced by the respondents.

6. It is clarified that the observations and discussions recorded in this order are strictly limited to the issues arising in the present proceedings and are intended solely for the purpose of adjudicating the specific controversy before this Court. They shall not, in any manner, be treated as a determination or expression of opinion on the merits of the main case itself.

7. In view of the adjudication and final disposal of the principal matter, all pending miscellaneous applications, if any, that have been filed in relation to, or arise out of, the main proceedings, stand disposed of accordingly. Such disposal is consequential to the judgment rendered herein and does not require any separate or independent adjudication.

15.09.2025
Gaurav Sorot

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking?	Yes / No
Whether reportable?	Yes / No