



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

154

CWP-9701-2026

Date of Decision: 01.04.2026

RANJODH SINGH SAMRA

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Ashish Chopra, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Gagandeep Singh Virk, Advocate and
Mr. Yash Pal Sharma, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, D.A.G., Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 05.03.2026 passed by respondent No.2 and order dated 01.10.2025 passed by respondent No.3.

2. By orders dated 05.03.2026 read with 01.10.2025, the Revenue Authorities have prepared inquiry report holding two Revenue Officers and petitioner guilty of misrepresentation and getting sale deed registered, despite Court orders.

3. The petitioner claims that he has filed multiple suits against respondent No.4 with respect to dispute of land between the parties. The respondent No.4 filed a Civil Suit. Civil in which Court vide order dated 01.04.2024 passed interim order. During the pendency of litigation initiated by respondent No.4, the petitioner executed four sale deeds. The respondent



No.4 filed contempt petition before Civil Court as well as this Hon'ble Court on account of execution of sale deeds. Petition before Civil Court is still pending, however, petition filed before this Court was dismissed vide order dated 28.10.2025. The respondent No.4 moved a representation before Revenue Authorities which initiated inquiry with respect to respondent No.4's allegations. The petitioner sent reply to complaint filed by respondent No.4. Despite reply, the inquiry officer-SDM (East) did not summon him or granted opportunity of hearing. The Inquiry Officer-SDM (East) vide order dated 01.10.2025 concluded that petitioner and other Revenue Officials have violated orders of Civil Court. He moved an application before Deputy Commissioner seeking re-inquiry on the ground that he was not heard and matter should not be inquired in the light of pending civil litigation. Learned Additional Deputy Commissioner dismissed his application seeking re-inquiry.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner had no concern with execution of sale deeds which formed foundation of entire litigation. It was his father who executed sale deed with respect to his share. The private respondent filed application under Order 39 Rule 2A before Civil Court which is still pending. During the pendency of said application, there was no occasion for the respondent to conduct inquiry and pass impugned orders. The respondent despite his request that he had no concern with execution of sale deed, was not heard and his representation was rejected.

5. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

6. From the perusal of record, it is evident that there is a land dispute between petitioner and private respondent. The private respondent has filed Civil Suit against petitioner. There was interim order in his favour. As per private respondent, the petitioner in connivance with Revenue



Officers executed sale deeds which were in direct violation of interim orders of Civil Court. He filed petition before this Court as well as Civil Court seeking initiation of contempt proceedings. Petition before this Court stands dismissed, however, petition before Civil Court is still pending. During the pendency of contempt proceedings, the private respondent approached Deputy Commissioner to initiate proceedings against officers and private parties for violation of interim order of Civil Court. On the direction of Deputy Commissioner, the Sub Divisional Magistrate (SDM) prepared inquiry report wherein Revenue Officials as well as private persons were found guilty. Inquiry report is primarily against the officials. The authorities are bound to examine misconduct of their subordinates. As matter is pending before Civil Court whose order is alleged to be violated, the findings recorded by SDM qua petitioner who is not Government official, would not influence the judgment of Civil Court. The said Court would examine its order, conduct of parties and violation, if any. No interference of this Court is warranted.

7. Disposed of.
8. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

01.04.2026
SDK

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No