



**205-2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CACP-10-2008 (O&M)
Date of Decision:11.02.2026

GURDEEP SINGH AND ANOTHER

....APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

LABH SINGH

....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR

Present: Mr. Saket Bhandari, Advocate for
Mr. R. S. Manhas, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Didar Singh, Advocate and
Ms. Avneet Kaur Mangat, Advocate
for the respondent.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. This contempt appeal arises out of an order passed by the learned Single Judge on 30.05.2008 in COCP No.400 of 2006. The contempt petition was filed on the ground that notwithstanding an injunction order passed on 26.04.1999 in RSA No. 1247 of 1999, the property in question was transferred by way of registered sale deed on 22.02.2006. In the contempt petition following directions were issued by the learned Single Judge:-

*“(i) the Collector and Sub-Registrar, Mohali are directed to cancel forthwith the sale deed No.4141 dated 22.02.2006 executed by respondents No.2 & 3 in favour of respondents No.4 & 5 in their capacity as holders of General Power of Attorney of respondent No.1;
(ii) the stamp duty affixed on the sale deed shall stand forfeited;
(iii) it shall be open to respondents No.4 & 5 to recover the sale consideration, if any, paid to respondent No.1 in accordance with law;
(iv) The ‘agreement to sell’, if any, entered into by respondent No.1 in favour of other respondents shall remain*

intact but in abeyance leaving it open for the other respondents to seek enforcement thereof after the decision of RSA No.1247 of 1997 and/or vacation of injunction order;
(v) *henceforth, the Collector and Sub-Registrar, Mohali are also restrained from executing any sale deed and/or Transfer-Deed in respect of the land in dispute till the injunction order passed by this Court is operative.”*

2. It is not in dispute that the pending RSA has been disposed of on the basis of compromise entered into between the parties. None has appeared to press the appeal though it is pending since 2008. Eighteen years have gone by and the order sheet shows that the matter has been adjourned on various occasions. It was specifically fixed for arguments today *vide* order dated 12.01.2026. Considering the fact that the matter is very old and the parties have compromised their case, we are not inclined to accept request for adjournment made on behalf of counsel for the appellants.

3. Consequently, the instant appeal fails and is dismissed for want of prosecution.

4. All pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 11, 2026
Rahul Joshi

1. Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
2. Whether Reportable	Yes/No