



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

**COCP-224-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 30.09.2025**

Tarlok SinghPetitioner

Vs.

Lakhvir Singh and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Animesh Sharma, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Rohit Duggal, Advocate, for
Mr. Ravi Chadda, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Vijay Kumar Chaudhary, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 and 7.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (ORAL)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 09.11.2022 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in CWP-25490-2022.

2. The Division Bench of this Court had issued the following directions in CWP-25490-2022, vide its order dated 09.11.2022:-

“Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that proceedings under Section 7 and 11 of the Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961 have been stayed in CWP-15964-2016, which stands admitted. Learned counsel further relies on pendency of CWP-15980-2022 and other connected matters wherein similar instructions dated 21.06.2022 issued by the State of Haryana as the impugned instructions dated 11.10.2022 (Annexure P-38), are under challenge and interim relief has been afforded in the said writ petitions.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Sandeep Jain, Additional A.G. Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents no.1 to 5.



Notice be issued to respondent no.6, for 16.11.2022.

Dasti as well.

Operation of impugned instructions dated 11.10.2022 (Annexure P-38) to remain stayed till the next date of hearing.”

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner was not even the party in the writ petition i.e. CWP-25490-2022. Otherwise also, the said writ petition has been decided by the Division Bench of this Court, vide order dated 17.03.2023.

4. On the last date of hearing, this Court had directed the Registry to issue notice to the petitioner as well as his counsel about the next date of hearing.

5. Today also, despite service, none has put in appearance on behalf of the petitioner. It seems that the petitioner is no more interested in pursuing the matter. Therefore, this Court is left with no other option but to dismiss the present petition for want of prosecution.

6. Accordingly, the present petition is **dismissed** for want of prosecution.

7. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

30.09.2025

Virender

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No