



CWP-22852-2025

-1-

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

115

CWP-22852-2025

Date of Decision: 19.03.2026

Parminder Kaur**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and another****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present: - Mr. Priyanshu Kamra, Advocate for the petitioner
(*through video conferencing*)

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to official respondents to initiate disciplinary inquiry against Jagsir Singh-Tehsildar-respondent No.5 who has registered sale deeds despite stay order dated 03.01.2022 passed by Civil Court, Jagraon.

2. As per the petitioner, respondent No.5-Tehsildar, misusing his official position, has sanctioned mutation dated 05.05.2023 for sale deed dated 26.04.2023 despite stay order dated 03.01.2022 passed by Civil Court, Jagraon.

3. As per affidavit filed by respondent, the Civil Court by aforesaid order, in order to protect the suit land as well as to prevent multiplicity of litigation, directed the parties to maintain *status quo qua* possession over the shared house. The order was only to maintain *status quo qua* possession over the shared house. There was no stay with respect to sale

of agriculture land, thus, there was no violation of Court orders. The petitioner has alternative remedy to file application under Order 39 Rule 2A of Civil Procedure Code, 1908.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per order dated 03.01.2022 passed by Civil Judge (Junior Division) Jagraon, the parties were supposed to maintain *status quo qua* suit property whereas respondent in the affidavit has disclosed that *status quo* was required to be maintained *qua* shared house.

5. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

6. This Court while exercising writ jurisdiction cannot adjudicate question whether Civil Court had stayed alienation *qua* shared house or entire suit property. The petitioner has remedy to approach Civil Court and may also initiate contempt proceedings, if permissible by law. This Court cannot ask departmental authorities to take action against officers because Civil Court or Contempt Court is competent for the said purpose.

7. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that present petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

19.03.2026
Mohit Kumar

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No