



115

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CWP-12223-2026 (O&M)****Date of Decision : 22.04.2026**

RAMNIWAS

.... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI**

Present : Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate and
Ms. Sumitra, Advocate for the petitioner.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

1. Challenge in the present writ petition is to the order dated 12.03.2025 (Annexure P-8) whereby the revision filed by the petitioner herein was dismissed for non-prosecution and the order dated 18.12.2025 (Annexure P-10) whereby the application filed by the petitioner herein for restoration of the revision was also dismissed, both passed by respondent No.2.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the counsel for the revisionist was busy before some other Court and as such he could not attend the present case on 12.03.2025. It is further the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the application for restoration of the revision was filed within a period of 30 days, however, the said application was also dismissed on 18.12.2025.

3. Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 5 only, at this stage.

4. Mr. Saurabh Mago, DAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 5.

5. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. In the present case cogent reason was given by the counsel for the revisionist for not being able to attend the Court on 12.03.2025. The restoration application was also filed by the revisionist within a period of 30 days. That being so and keeping in view the nature of the litigation, the application for restoration of the revision filed by the petitioner herein ought to have been allowed.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for respondents No.1 to 5 states that a direction may be given for a time bound disposal of the revision petition.

8. In view of the statement made by the learned counsel for the parties and in view of the fact that cogent reason was given by the counsel for the revisionist for not being able to attend the Court on 12.03.2025, coupled with the fact that the application for restoration was also filed well within the prescribed period, this Court deems it fit to set aside the impugned orders.

9. Accordingly, the present writ petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 12.03.2025 (Annexure P-8) and the impugned order dated 18.12.2025 (Annexure P-10) are set aside. The matter is remanded back to the Divisional Commissioner, Karnal for a decision afresh on merits in accordance with law within a period of three months from today. The parties shall appear before the Divisional Commissioner, Karnal, on **06.05.2026** at 10:00 am.

10. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

22.04.2026
Aman Jain

(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: Yes/No