



CWP-27758-2025

-1-

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

Sr. No.127

CWP-27758-2025

Date of decision: 17.09.2025

Randhir Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE LAPITA BANERJI**

Present: Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mago, DAG, Haryana.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

1. Gram Panchayat, Kutani and the petitioner filed an application under Section 7(2) of the Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961 (for short – the Act) seeking therein ejectment of the private respondents from Panchayat land of which, according to the Gram Panchayat and the petitioner, they were in illegal possession of. Such application was allowed through order of respondent No.3 dated 13.04.2022 and such order attained finality.

2. On 08.06.2022, the petitioner filed an application before



CWP-27758-2025

-2-

respondent No.3 seeking therein execution of the afore-referred order dated 13.04.2022, which application of his remains pending for the last about 3 ½ years.

3. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and going through the record, we find that respondent No.3 has unnecessarily delayed the final decision on the petitioner's execution application. In fact, the interim orders passed by respondent No.3 show that they have been passed rather mechanically repeatedly requiring filing of a status report by the concerned Block Development and Panchayat Officer (for short – BDPO) which status report, even after the passage of 3 ½ years has not been submitted. Thus, the BDPO is found to be at fault in not submitting the status report and respondent No.3 for having mechanically adjourned the matter for want of filing of the status report by the BDPO.

4. Even otherwise, all parties to a *lis* are entitled to speedy disposal of their *lis* and a direction to decide such *lis* at an early date prejudices none.

5. In the light of the above, we allowed this petition with a direction to respondent No.3 to decide the petitioner's aforesaid execution petition within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, after hearing all affected parties, in accordance with law.

6. The State is further directed to take appropriate disciplinary action against respondent No.3 and the concerned BDPO for having unnecessarily delaying the disposal of the petitioner's execution petition.

7. For submission of compliance report by the State with regard to



CWP-27758-2025

-3-

the disciplinary action taken against both the aforesaid officers, the matter
be listed on 18.11.2025.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

(LAPITA BANERJI)
JUDGE

September 17, 2025
Jyoti 1

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