



144

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

CWP-13486-2026

Date of decision: 06.05.2026

RAVI SINGH AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

VERSUS

UNION TERRITORY OF CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present: Mr. Vipul Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kunal Mulwani, Addl. Senior Standing Counsel with
Ms. Urvashi Singh, Junior Panel Counsel
for the respondents No.1 to 3.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

1. The limited prayer made in this writ petition is for issuance of writ of mandamus directing the official respondents to maintain status quo and not to implement order dated 23.04.2026 (Annexure P-8) passed by the Chief Administrator, U.T. Chandigarh.

2. Counsel for the petitioners states that proceedings under the Capital of Punjab (Development and Regulation) Act, 1952 (for short "1952 Act") were initiated and an order dated 08.05.2025 (Annexure P-3) was passed by the Sub Divisional Magistrate (East), Chandigarh, which was assailed in separate appeals filed by petitioners. Counsel submits that the appeals have been dismissed by the Chief Administrator, UT. Chandigarh vide order dated 23.04.2026 (Annexure P-8) against which, a revision petition (Anenxure P-9) has been preferred. Counsel asserts that the revision petition is accompanying with an application for stay and both the appeal as well as application are likely to be heard on 14.05.2026, the date given by the revisional authority. Counsel states that the apprehension of the



petitioners is that in case, impugned order is given effect to, petitioners’ right in the property shall be adversely affected. He has therefore, sought interim protection till the time, the application for stay is heard.

3. On advanced copy, counsel for U.T. Chandigarh submits that the action has been initiated under the provisions of the 1952 Act as the petitioners failed to deposit the ground rent as well as interest due thereon. He has supported the orders passed by the authorities. He has instructions to state that the revision petition is coming up for hearing on 14.05.2026.

4. Be that as it may, as the petitioners have availed the statutory remedy and has filed a revision petition under Section 10(4) of the 1952 Act read with the Chandigarh Estate Rules, 2007, they deserve to be granted interim protection till the time, their prayer for stay is considered. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction that the parties shall maintain a status quo over the property till the time the prayer for interim stay is heard by the revisional authority.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

06.05.2026
Priyanka Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No