



COCP No.5151 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

215

COCP No.5151 of 2025
Date of decision: November 10th, 2025

Dilawar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Aashika Jain, IAS and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Rai Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Respondent No.1-Ms. Aashika Jain, Deputy Commissioner,
Hoshiarpur (through V.C.).

Mr. Sapan Dhir, Advocate (through V.C.)
with Ms. Raj Kaur and Ms. Tanya Mittal, Advocates
for respondent No.2.

Mr. Sandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a contempt petition under Sections 10 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.
2. On 16.10.2025, this Court was pleased to pass the following order:

“Inter alia contends that in the present case, respondent No.2 was appointed as Lambardar vide order dated 10.07.2014 but however no sanad was issued in favour of respondent No.2. It is further submitted that the petitioner had filed an appeal against the order dated 10.07.2014 and vide order dated 08.04.2016, order dated



COC P No.5151 of 2025

10.07.2014 was set aside and the present petitioner was appointed as Lambardar. It is argued that in pursuance of the order passed by the Commissioner (Appeals), Jalandhar on 08.04.2016, sanad was issued in favour of the petitioner on 04.08.2016 (Annexure P-5) and the petitioner had started discharging the duties of Lambardar and it is thereafter that on 16.07.2018, the Financial Commissioner, Punjab had set aside the order dated 08.04.2016 which order of the Financial Commissioner was challenged by the petitioner by filing CWP-4179-2019 in which on 14.03.2019, a Coordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to issue notice of motion and also stay the operation of the impugned order (i.e., of Financial Commissioner) till the next date of hearing. It is submitted that thereafter, respondent No.4 (respondent No.2 herein) moved an application for vacation of said order and has referred to the various zimni orders passed to show that although, notice has been issued in the said application for vacation of order but interim order in favour of the petitioner has not been vacated and the interim order is still continuing. It is submitted that in spite of matter being pending before this Court, respondent No.2 had initially moved a complaint before the police which was filed but after that in violation of the order passed by this Court, he had moved another application before the Deputy Commissioner-cum-Collector and the Deputy Commissioner-cum-Collector vide order dated 23.09.2025 (Annexure P-13) had stopped both the candidates including the present petitioner from acting as Lambardar till the time the writ petition is decided. It is submitted that order passed by the Deputy Commissioner is in the teeth of the order passed by this



COCF No.5151 of 2025

Court as well as is completely without jurisdiction and in effect nullifies the operation of the interim order granted in favour of the petitioner. It is submitted that once the operation of the order passed by the Financial Commissioner had been stayed, necessary consequence of the same was that order of the Commissioner was operational and since the petitioner had sanad in his favour, so he was discharging his duties as Lambardar and he had to be permitted to discharge his duty as Lambardar till the time the interim order was continuing. It is further submitted that on account of the order passed by the Deputy Commissioner, which is in the teeth of the order passed by this Court, irreparable loss has been caused to the villagers as there is no Lambardar to carry out the necessary duties of Lambardar under the Punjab Land Revenue Act.

Notice of motion to the respondents to show cause as to why contempt proceedings should not be initiated against them.

Mr. Sandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab, appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr. Sapan Dhir, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and pray for an adjournment to get instructions in the matter.

Adjourned to 10.11.2025.

To be taken up at 12:00 noon.

Respondent No.1 is directed to be present before this Court through Video Conferencing on the next date of hearing.

16.10.2025”

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has very fairly submitted



COCP No.5151 of 2025

that respondent No.2 be permitted to withdraw the application in pursuance to which the order dated 23.09.2025 (Annexure P-13) has been passed. It is, however, submitted that the withdrawal of the said application should not come in the way of respondent No.2 from raising all pleas which are available to him in CWP-4179-2019 and also in CM-3710-CWP-2020.

4. Respondent No.1 appearing through video conferencing has submitted that the order dated 23.09.2025 was passed by respondent No.1 on a *bona fide* understanding of the facts and has further submitted that since respondent No.2 has withdrawn the application and respondent No.1 has also understood the case in the right perspective, thus, respondent No.1 seeks to withdraw the order dated 23.09.2025 with liberty to the State to raise all pleas which are available to them in the abovesaid writ petition, if so advised.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in view of the stand taken by respondents No.1 and 2, the present contempt petition be disposed of.

6. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present contempt petition is disposed of.

November 10th, 2025

Puneet

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No