



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

143

CWP-13205-2026**Date of Decision: 30.04.2026**

SARABJIT KAUR

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Munish Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioner

Ms. Neha Sonawane, DAG Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 52 of BNSS, 2023 is seeking direction to official respondents to act in accordance with law and not to stop him from harvesting standing crops. He is further seeking direction to respondents to decide his representations (Annexures P-11 & P-12).

2. As per pleadings, the petitioner is in lawful possession of land measuring 52 Kanal 9 Marla situated in village Jouneke, District Tarn Taran which was purchased vide two registered sale deeds dated 11.04.2025 from Amrik Singh and Kulwant Singh who had derived valid title from one Shinder Kaur. Civil Courts have recognised possession of petitioner's predecessor-in-interest. With respect to disputed land, *RSA-1652-2016* is pending before this court wherein vide order dated

22.04.2016 parties have been directed to maintain status quo. Respondent No.5 approached this Court by way of *CRWP-3577-2026* which was disposed of vide order dated 02.04.2026 to take action in accordance with law. Taking advantage of said order, she is filing complaints with an oblique motive to harass the petitioner and convert civil dispute into criminal matter. The petitioner has never violated status quo order. She has sent representations to respondents No. 3 and 4 to direct respondent No. 5 not to interfere in harvesting of standing crops but to no avail.

3. As per petitioner herself, there is order dated 24.04.2016 passed by this Court whereby parties have been directed to maintain *status quo*. The petitioner is claiming that respondent No.5 in connivance with official respondents is interfering in her possession.

4. In view of interim order, the petitioner has alternative remedies. Any order of this Court would amount to interference in proceedings pending in aforesaid RSA.

5. Disposed of. The Court is sanguine that authorities would not violate interim orders passed by this Court.

6. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

April 30, 2026
Deepak DPA

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