



113

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

COCP-5984-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.12.2025

Gurmeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Ashok Kumar Munjal and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Narender Pal Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 05.12.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

*“Present:- Mr. Narender Pal Bhardwaj, Advocate and
Ms. Amanpreet Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.*

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 11.01.2023 had observed that the Gram Panchayat Kalri Khalsa, in whose favour there was order dated 20.10.2015 was to file execution within a period of one month from 11.01.2023. It is submitted that till date, no such execution has been filed by the Gram Panchayat.

On a pointed query raised by this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner has fairly submitted that in case the abovesaid averment is found to be false, cost of Rs.50,000/- may be imposed on the petitioner.

Notice of motion to respondent No.2 only at this stage for 22.12.2025.

To be taken up in the urgent list.

05.12.2025”



2. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has submitted that eviction order in the present case was passed on 20.10.2015 and the Gram Panchayat had filed execution application on 03.01.2017 and as is apparent from order dated 19.10.2022, a copy of which has been handed over to this Court and is taken on record and marked as Mark "A", even the possession from the encroachers has been taken. It is further submitted that even a perusal of notice (Annexure P-3) which has been annexed by the petitioner along with the present revision petition itself shows that the Gram Panchayat had filed execution application in the Court and thus, statement made on behalf of the petitioner on 05.12.2025 to the effect that execution has not been filed was a false statement. It is further submitted that writ petition filed by the petitioner before the Division Bench of this Court was disposed of without Gram Panchayat having been heard and thus, the said facts could not be brought to the notice of the Division Bench of this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in view of the above, he seeks to withdraw the present contempt petition.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present contempt petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

5. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

22.12.2025

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No