

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH****CR-1543-2020 (O&M)****Date of Decision : 09.02.2026**

Kashmiri Lal Kapoor

... Petitioner

Versus

The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Rohtak
and Another

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Deepak Girotra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Addl. AG Haryana for the respondents.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. Present revision petition has been filed by the plaintiff-petitioner challenging the order dated 31.08.2018 passed by the Executing Court whereby the application filed by the plaintiff-petitioner has been disposed off as also the order dated 02.11.2019 passed by the First Appellate Court whereby the appeal filed by the plaintiff-petitioner against the order dated 31.08.2018 has been dismissed.

2. The brief facts relevant to the present *lis* are that the plaintiff-petitioner herein filed a civil suit for declaration and consequential relief of mandatory injunction. The suit was that the plaintiff-petitioner, who was Surveyor-cum-Draftsman/Architect, was not being granted renewal of his registration for the year 2013. The suit was decreed vide judgment and decree dated 22.12.2015. The plaintiff-petitioner thereafter wrote a letter to the Joint

Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Rohtak requesting him for registration of the plaintiff-petitioner as a Surveyor-cum-Draftsman/ Architect for the period 2013 to 2016 in terms of the order of the Court. Thereafter, execution was filed on 26.09.2016 seeking renewal of the registration as a Surveyor-cum-Draftsman/Architect from the year 2013 to 2016. Objections were filed on behalf of the Judgment Debtors (respondents herein). Reply was filed to the objections. Vide the impugned orders the objections filed by the JDs were allowed holding that as per the decree passed, the license of the plaintiff-petitioner had been renewed for the year 2013, however, no fresh application has been filed by the plaintiff-petitioner for further renewal for the year 2014 onwards. It was further held that for granting the license for a further period the plaintiff-petitioner would have to file a requisite application and deposit the fee as per rules and the Department would consider the same in accordance with law. Aggrieved by the same, present revision petition has been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the plaintiff-petitioner would contend that once there was a decree in favour of the plaintiff-petitioner, it was incumbent on the respondents to have renewed his license till 2016.

4. *Per contra* learned State counsel has pointed out that the period for which the renewal was sought in the suit was only for the year 2013, which was accordingly done and license of the plaintiff-petitioner was renewed for the period 2013. However, thereafter no application was moved. The licence is to be issued year to year, and the plaintiff-petitioner did not file any application nor deposit the fee. In the absence of the same, no further renewal could have been granted on the basis of the decree.

5. Heard.

6. In the present case, the license for Surveyor-cum-Draftsman/Architect is granted on a year-to-year basis. The suit pertained to renewal of the license only for the year 2013. Post the decree the license was renewed for the period 2013. Thereafter, the plaintiff-petitioner did not file any application for renewal of his license nor deposited the fee regarding the same. In the absence of any application having been filed or any fee having been deposited, merely on the strength of the decree which pertained to the period 2013, no further renewal can be granted.

7. In view of the above, present revision petition being devoid of any merit is accordingly dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

09.02.2026
jk

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO