



140

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

CWP-11477-2026 (O&M)**Date of Decision: 16.04.2026**

Upkar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Harlove Singh Rajput, Advocate,
Mr. Pardeep Kamboj, Advocate and
Mr. Parampal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Arora, DAG, Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside action of Tehsildar, Sangrur-Respondent No. 2 whereby possession of disputed land in question has been handed over to Respondents No. 3 and 4 without filing any application under section 145(6) Cr.P.C/Section 164(6) BNSS.

2. The dispute pertains to land measuring 17 Bigha 16 Biswa, forming part of the estate of late Sh. Jagjit Singh, situated in village Thales, District Sangrur. Respondent No. 3 filed application dated 20.10.2006 before the Additional Deputy Commissioner, Sangrur, alleging therein that the Petitioner was not permitting her to harvest the paddy crop allegedly sown by her on the aforesaid land and was interfering in her possession. She further sought police assistance for harvesting the crop. On the basis of the report dated 07.11.2006 submitted by the Additional District Magistrate, Sangrur and order dated 17.11.2016 of the District Magistrate, Sangrur, it was observed that considering the

subsisting dispute between the parties and the fact that the crop standing on the land had ripened, proceedings under Section 145 Cr.P.C. be initiated in respect of the aforesaid land. Pursuant thereto, proceedings under Section 145 Cr.P.C. came to be initiated before the learned Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sangrur and subjected property was attached vide order dated 09.11.2006. The proceedings under Section 145 Cr.P.C. were initiated in the year 2006 whereby the private respondents (Respondent Nos. 3 & 4), who constituted Party No. 1 before the Learned SDM, Sangrur, filed their claim on 08.11.2011 whereafter the Petitioner filed his claim on 16.02.2012. Learned SDM, Sangrur passed the final order dated 09.02.2026 whereby it was held that the land in question was in the possession of the private respondents (Respondent No's. 3 & 4), who constituted Party No. 1 before the initiation of the proceedings under Section 145 Cr.P.C. and dismissed the said application. Learned SDM, Sangrur, vide order 25.05.2018 (Annexure P-5) closed the evidence of the petitioner and vide order dated 20.07.2018 (Annexure P-6) opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses of concerned Respondents was closed. Pursuant to which the Petitioner preferred two Revision Petitions against both the orders. Criminal Revision No. 275/2018 filed against the order dated 20.07.2018 was allowed and petitioner vide order dated 01.10.2025 was granted an opportunity to cross-examine witnesses of the concerned Respondents. However, Criminal Revision No.194/2018 against the order dated 25.05.2018 was dismissed by learned ASJ, Sangrur vide order dated 01.10.2025. The Petitioner approached this Hon'ble Court by way of CRM-M-1822-2026, however, during the pendency of the said petition the final order dated 09.02.2026 was passed. The petitioner preferred a revision with the prayer to set aside the said order and appoint a receiver *qua* subjected property. Respondents No. 3 and 4 suffered a statement before learned

ASJ, Sangrur on 06.03.2026 that possession of property in dispute has already been delivered to them along with standing crop after making payment of standing crop to the persons to whom the land in dispute was given on lease by the receiver/Tehsildar, Sangrur. The Petitioner was not having any knowledge as to the delivery of the possession of the property in dispute to the concerned Respondents and he also suffered his statement to this regard. Thereafter, vide order dated 06.03.2026 (Annexure P-11), learned ASJ, Sangrur ordered that status quo be maintained with regard to the property in dispute.

3. Learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that he is not aggrieved by order dated 06.03.2026 passed by learned ASJ, Sangrur whereas he is aggrieved from conduct of Tehsildar.

4. Matter is pending before learned ASJ, Sangrur. The petitioner has remedy to raise his grievance before learned ASJ, Sangrur and if he is aggrieved from any order, he may avail remedies as permissible under Cr.P.C./BNSS. The petitioner may further approach higher revenue authorities against act and conduct of Tehsildar. There is no occasion for this Court to interfere at this stage.

5. ***Dismissed.***

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

16.04.2026
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No