



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

**CWP-18565-2001(O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.02.2026**

RATI RAM **... PETITIONER**
VS.
STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. **... RESPONDENTS**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Abhimanyu Antil, DAG, Haryana.

HARSH BUNGER, J. (ORAL)

The instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *Certiorari* for quashing of order dated 08.06.1998 as well as order dated 09.06.1999, whereby proceedings under Section 53 of the Haryana Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 were initiated against the petitioner for recovery of Rs.5,67,881.00/-

2. Perusal of order sheets would show that while issuing notice of motion by the Division Bench of this Court, the following order was passed on 27.11.2001

*“Notice of motion for April 23, 2002.
Stay arrest.”*

3. The aforesaid interim order was vacated on 23.04.2002 which reads as under:-

“Ms Palika Monga states that the written statement on behalf of the respondents has already been filed in the Registry on April 20, 2002. She further states that a copy had been offered to the counsel for the petitioner, who had refused to accept.

Counsel for the petitioner is not present. It

appears that having got an interim stay of arrest, the effort is to delay the proceedings.

Adjourned to May 6, 2002.

However, the interim order passed on November 27, 2001 is vacated.”

4. Subsequently, another application bearing CM-6974-2002 was filed for staying the recovery from the petitioner. However, the said prayer was also rejected.

5. Thereafter, another application bearing CM-25499-2003 was filed on behalf of the petitioner again seeking decision on the main writ petition and in the alternative for staying the recovery of amount. However, the said application was also dismissed with costs of Rs.5000/- vide order dated 13.11.2003, which reads as under:-

“Initially vide order dated 27.11.2001, notice of motion was issued in the main case and arrest was stayed. Later on, vide order dated 23.4.2002, the interim order dated 27.11.2001 was vacated and the case was adjourned. Vide order dated 10.1.2003, while adjourning the case it was made clear that the respondents shall be free to take recourse to all available methods for recovery of the amount due from the petitioner, keeping in view the fact that the interim order dated 27.11.2001 had been vacated. Subsequently, vide order dated 11.3.2003, the writ petition was admitted to a regular hearing.

Thereafter the petitioner filed an application bearing CM 6974/2003 for staying the recovery from the petitioner or in the alternative directing the respondents not to adopt coercive methods. In the said application, no reference was made with regard to the earlier orders passed by this court. Vide order dated 27.3.2003 the said application was dismissed being misconceived. Thereafter, petitioner filed another application bearing CM 19152 of 2003 for staying the recovery in dispute and in the alternative for staying the operation of the impugned orders and in the alternative for hearing the writ petition on some early actual date.

This application filed by the petitioner was dismissed by this court on 28.8.2003. Now the petitioner has filed the present application for deciding the main writ petition and in the alternative staying the recovery of the amount or staying the operation of the impugned order.

After hearing the learned counsel for the applicant petitioner and after perusing the record, in my opinion, the present application deserves to be dismissed with costs, in view of the earlier orders passed by this court. Accordingly, present application is dismissed and a cost of Rs.5000/- is imposed upon the petitioner to be paid to respondents.”

6. Today, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.
7. Learned State counsel further informs the Court that the petitioner has also not participated in the inquiry proceedings. It appears that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the present petition.
8. Dismissed for non-prosecution.
9. Copy of this order be sent to the petitioner at the address given in the Memo of Parties.
10. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.

**(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE**

27.02.2026
smriti

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No