



CWP-17155-2025

-1-

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

123

CWP-17155-2025

Date of Decision: 03.06.2025

Guru Granth Sahib Ji

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present: - Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Karunesh Kaushal, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab  
\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J.** (Oral)

1. On the previous occasions, it has been noticed that Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate does not make distinction between synopsis and list of dates & events. The synopsis merely replicate the list of dates & events and this practice has also been followed in the present petition. The requirement of filing synopsis besides list of dates & events serves a distinct purpose. When both documents are identical, the intended objective is defeated.

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of direction by Collector to the effect that official Receiver of the Dera be appointed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Appellate Authority in terms of provisions of Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 adjudicated appeal filed by Prem Dass vide impugned order dated 16.04.2025 (Annexure P-4). The Appellate Authority after disposing of



CWP-17155-2025

-2-

appeal, directed to officer in-charge to make appointment of Receiver of the Dera on the ground that there is no Mohtmim of the Dera as per official record. As soon as Appellate Authority adjudicated appeal, he became *functus officio* and had no authority to issue directions with respect to appointment of Receiver of the property. The petitioner has preferred appeal against impugned appellate order, however, the impugned direction may be stayed or set aside till the adjudication of appeal.

4. Learned state counsel, who on advance notice is present in Court, concedes that petitioner has preferred appeal before the Appellate Authority-Commissioner which is still pending. He expressed his inability to controvert the fact that impugned direction has been issued after adjudication of the appeal filed by respondent before Collector, Nabha.

5. In the backdrop, this Court finds it appropriate to direct the authorities not to implement impugned direction till the adjudication of appeal by Appellate Authority i.e. Commissioner, Patiala Division, Patiala.

6. Disposed of in above terms.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)  
JUDGE

03.06.2025

*Mohit Kumar*

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