



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

COCP-3294-2025(O&M)
Date of decision: 18.03.2026

Amrik Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Bahadur Singh and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. R.M. Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arvind Kashyap, Advocate, and
Ms. Bhumija Gupta, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

Ms. Shiny Chopra, AAG, Punjab.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

The instant contempt petition alleges willful disobedience of the order dated 14.12.2012 (Annexure P-1), passed in RSA-1061-2010, vide which parties were directed to maintain status quo as regards the suit property.

2. The allegation is that despite the aforesaid order having been passed, respondent No.1-Bahadur Singh moved an application before the revenue authorities seeking mutation of the land in question on the basis of the judgment and decree under challenge. He is also stated to have given an affidavit to the effect that no appeal was pending against the said judgment and decree.

3. In the reply filed by way of affidavit by respondent No.1, he has conceded that such an affidavit was given, but has stated that he was under the impression that an appeal is different from a regular second appeal.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

5. At the outset, learned counsel representing respondent No.1 submits that filing of the application along with the affidavit was a result of



a bona fide error and a mistaken impression. He further submits that he has instructions to state that within 10 days from today, the respondent shall move an application before the concerned authorities for reversing the said mutation to its previous position.

6. On the asking of the Court, learned State counsel appears and undertakes that the requisite instructions shall be passed to the concerned authorities for dealing with the application accordingly and reversing the entries to the previous stage.

7. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 further submits that respondent No.1 shall not alienate the suit property during the pendency of the regular second appeal.

8. That being so, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner would have no objection in case such an application is moved by respondent No.1 and the mutation is restored to its previous position. He further submits that under the circumstances, the petitioner does not wish to press the instant contempt petition.

9. Accordingly, the present contempt petition is disposed of in terms of the statements given by learned counsel for the parties, binding them to the same.

10. Rule stands discharged.

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

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

March 18, 2026
Rajan

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