



122

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**CWP-14648-2026 (O&M)****Date of Decision : 12.05.2026**

Rajesh Kumar and Another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

... Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Ajay K. Yadav, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Mago, DAG Haryana for respondent Nos.1 to 5.

Mr. Ajay Vijarania, Advocate for respondent No.6.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* restraining the respondents from changing the nature of the land by carrying out any construction over it.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon the judgments of the Supreme Court in the cases of **Hinch Lal Tiwari vs. Kamala Devi & Ors. [2001 (6) SCC 496]**, **Jagpal Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Ors. [2011 (1) RCR (Civil) 912]** and those of this Court in the cases of **Gulzar Singh vs. State of Haryana & Ors. [CWP-4952-2019 decided on 15.01.2020 = Law Finder Doc Id # 1686836]**, **Harnek Singh vs. State of Punjab & Ors. [2024 (1) RCR (Civil) 262]**, **Hinduwan Shamshan Bhumi, Tosham vs. State of Haryana & Ors. [2012 (67) RCR (Civil) 859]** and

Jaipal Panchal & Ors. vs. State of Haryana & Ors. [2023 NCPHHC 122281] to contend that the nature of the land cannot be changed by the Gram Panchayat.

3. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.6-Gram Panchayat on advance notice have put in appearance. Learned counsel for respondent No.6-Gram Panchayat has pointed out that a resolution was passed by the Gram Panchayat on 16.10.2024 followed by the order dated 25.10.2024 passed by the Block Development and Panchayat Officer. Neither the resolution passed by the Gram Panchayat nor the order passed by the Block Development and Panchayat Officer have been challenged by the petitioners till date. It has further been contended that one of the villagers had approached this Court by filing a contempt petition on the same cause of action being COCP-843-2026, which was dismissed vide order dated 24.02.2026. It has further been pointed out that some of the villagers had filed a civil suit on the same cause of action being CS-1329-2024 in which the prayer for grant of *ad interim* injunction was rejected vide order dated 09.12.2024 and the appeal being CMA-69-2024 challenging the said order also stood dismissed vide order dated 09.09.2025. Learned counsel for respondent No.6-Gram Panchayat has further stated that this is the third round of litigation that too without challenging the resolution and order of the Block Development and Panchayat Officer.

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

5. The judgments relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioners in the cases of **Hinch Lal Tiwari** (supra), **Jagpal Singh** (supra), **Gulzar Singh** (supra), **Harnek Singh** (supra), **Hinduwan Shamshan Bhumi, Tosham** (supra) and **Jaipal Panchal** (supra) would not come to his aid as in

the present case a resolution has been passed by the Gram Panchayat followed by the order passed by the Block Development and Panchayat Officer to which no challenge has been laid by the petitioners till date.

6. In view of the above, no ground is made out to entertain the present petition and the same is dismissed. Needless to say that the petitioner would be at liberty to challenge the resolution passed by the Gram Panchayat on 16.10.2024 followed by the order dated 25.10.2024 passed by the Block Development and Panchayat Officer, if so advised. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

**(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE**

12.05.2026
jk

**(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE**

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO