



CWP-3769-2025

(1)

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

[141]

CWP-3769-2025**Date of Decision: 11.02.2025**

JOGINDER SINGH AND OTHERS

..... PETITIONERS

VERSUS

DIVISIONAL DEPUTY DIRECTOR, RURAL DEVELOPMENT
AND PANCHAYATS (EXERCISING THE POWERS OF COLLECTOR),
PATIALA, TEHSIL AND DISTRICT BATALA & ORS.

..

....RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**Present: Mr. Jatinder Singla, Advocate and
Ms. Shivani Singla, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Maninder Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kashish Garg, Advocate for respondent No.2/Cavteator.

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

1. By filing the present writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners seek the quashing of the impugned order dated 24.09.2024 (Annexure P-7), passed by respondent No.1, besides seeking restoration of the status quo order dated 19.08.2024 (Annexure P-4), passed by respondent No.1, during the pendency of title suit before respondent No.1.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits, that during the pendency of the proceedings cast under Section 11 of The Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), the Collector concerned, on 19.08.2024 granted an order of status quo, in favour of the petitioners. Through an order made on 24.09.2024, the learned Collector concerned, vacated the stay order, which was granted in favour of the petitioners. Aggrieved therefrom, they preferred the present writ petition before this Court. In case the petitioners are yet dis-possessed from the disputed land(s), the whole purpose of filing the suit would be rendered infructuous.



CWP-3769-2025 (2)

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Maninder Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr. Kashish Garg, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2/Cavteator, have not disputed the factum of pendency of the suit cast under Section 11 of the Act. They very fairly submit that as of today, the parties may be again directed to maintain status-quo during the pendency of the suit and respondent No.1-Collector concerned, be directed to decide the pending suit in a time bound manner.

5. Since the matter is pending before the competent Authority, therefore, it would not be appropriate for this Court to express any opinion on the merits of the case.

6. Considering the above factual aspects, it would be appropriate to issue a direction to the competent Authority to, by passing a speaking order, decide the suit (Annexure P-1) within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, but after affording an adequate opportunity of hearing to all the concerned.

7. In consequence, the impugned order (Annexure P-7) is quashed, and, set aside, and, the parties are directed to maintain status-quo regarding possession.

8. Disposed of accordingly.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

11.02.2025

Anjal

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