



CWP-23920-2023

1

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

(251)

CWP-23920-2023

Date of Decision : 16.07.2025

Sri Adarsh Sanatan Dharam Dramatic Club (Regd.)

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Haryana
for respondents No.1 to 4.

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Advocate
for respondent No.5-MC Narnaul.

Mr. Manish Mehta, Advocate
for respondent No.6.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. The Deputy Commissioner, Mahendergarh at Narnaul, by drawing an administrative order dated 11.10.2023 (Annexure P-20), declined the permission to the petitioner, to organize *Ram Leela*, and *Shri Ram Katha and Pravachan*, upon the land in dispute, on account of pendency of dispute regarding ownership and pendency of *Kalendra* under Section 145 of Cr.P.C. The Deputy Commissioner concerned, observed that there is chance of disturbance of law and peace, and therefore, the asked for permission was not granted. This caused grievance to the petitioner-society, and propelled them to approach this Court, by casting the instant writ petition, under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking quashing of above said declining



order.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though earlier the Division Bench of this Court, vide order dated 16.10.2012 (Annexure P-8), had specifically restrained any person, to perform *Ram Leela*, or any other event, in the school compound. However, the petitioner-society is seeking permission to hold *Ram Leela*, only on the compound which is adjacent to the school, and the school compound is a different and segregated compound, through a common wall, which separates the said two compounds, therefore, the restriction imposed by the Division Bench of this Court, vide order (supra), is not applicable.

3. The submissions, so made by the learned counsel for the petitioner is opposed, tooth and nail, by learned counsel for the respondent No.6, on the ground, that in fact, the ownership dispute *qua* the land, in question, is already pending, and there is only one single compound, and therefore, the restraining order (supra), passed by the Division Bench of this Court, would not entitle the petitioner for the asked for relief.

4. While drawing an order dated 04.04.2025, this Court, had directed the Deputy Commissioner concerned, that after examining the actual position of the said land in question, file his/her personal affidavit, disclosing therein, as to whether, the school compound, and the adjacent compound, as alleged by the petitioner are different, upon which the petitioner-society wants to organize *Ram Leela* and *Sri Ram Katha and Pravachan*.

5. In deference to the directions (supra), as issued by this Court, vide order dated 04.04.2025, status report dated 11.07.2025, by way of affidavit of Dr. Vivek Bharti, IAS, Deputy Commissioner, Mahendergarh at Narnaul, filed today in the Court. The same is taken on record. Copy whereof,



has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. Before this Court would read the contents of the affidavit (supra), let us have a glance upon the order as passed by the Division Bench, *qua* the same land, on the similar issue, as arose before this Court, in the first round of litigation. The Division Bench of this Court, while disposing of LPA No.1651 of 2012, vide order dated 16.10.2012, had clarified the interim order, as passed by the Single Bench of this Court. The relevant is extracted hereinafter:-

“Learned counsel for the appellants categorically states that they have not nor they intend to perform Ram Lila in the 'school compound' and the venue of Ram Lila only adjoins the school compound.

We have heard learned counsel for the parties.

We clarify the interim order dated 12.10.2012, passed by learned Single Judge, to the extent that the District Administration, shall accord necessary permission to the appellants to perform/organize Ram Lila at a site other than the school compound. However, the timings or the volume of loud speaker shall be the same as decided by the Sub Divisional Officer (Civil), Narnaul, vide order dated 5.10.2012 (Annexure P-8).”

7. The Deputy Commissioner concerned, after examining the spot in dispute, has submitted that the height of the Dramatic Club Stage is approximately 03 feet above the ground level and in front of the stage, there is a sitting area of approximately 88 x 36 feet, at a depth of approximate 02 feet below the ground level, and there is no separate boundary wall of the disputed property. The report further clarifies that the disputed property, and the school, are part of the same compound, and same passage/path is used for both the school, and the disputed site. The relevant portion of the affidavit (supra), is



extracted hereinafter:-

“4. That deponent has inspected the disputed property on dated 01.07.2025 in the presence of both the parties to this writ petition along with Sub Divisional Officer (Civil) Narnaul, District Revenue Officer Narnaul Municipal Engineer Municipal Council Narnaul, Kanungo Halka Narnaul and Patwari Halka Narnaul. During the spot inspection Sub Divisional Officer (Civil) Narnaul and District Revenue Officer Narnaul have been directed by deponent to submit the report along with site plan of the spot. Accordingly Sub Divisional Officer (Civil) Narnaul and District Revenue Officer Narnaul have submitted the spot inspection report 01-07-2025 (Annexure-R-1) along with site plan.

5. That it is mentioned in the spot inspection report that the height of the Dramatic Club Stage is approximately 3feet above the ground level and in front of the stage there is a seating area of approximate 88X36 feet at a depth of approximate 2 feet below the ground level and there is no separate boundary wall of the disputed property. It is also mentioned in the report that disputed property and school are part of the same compound and same passage/path is used for both the school and disputed site (Dramatic Club).”

8. In view of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that there is a specific embargo imposed by the Division Bench of this Court, upon the District Administration, to grant the asked for permission.

9. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the instant writ petition, with liberty to avail all other alternate and efficacious remedy, as may be available to him, in accordance with law, for redressal of its grievance, as sought through the instant writ petition,

CWP-23920-2023

the Division Bench of this Court.

10. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **dismissed as withdrawn**, with the liberty as aforesaid.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

July 16, 2025
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No