



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

CWP-4754-2025

Date of Decision : 04.09.2025

SURINDER SINGH AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

UT CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Kanwaljit Singh, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Veer Imaan Singh Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anil Sharma, Advocate,
for respondent no.1.

Ms. Kuljeet Kaur, Advocate and
Mr. Sameesh Bassi, Advocate,
for respondent no.2.

Mr. Sangram Singh Saron, Advocate,
for respondent no.3.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. The instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, has been filed by the petitioners, who are the parents of respondent no.2, and mother-in-law and father-in-law of respondent no.3, fetching grievance from an order dated 25.10.2024 (Annexure P-15), passed by the learned appellate authority concerned, whereby, the appeal has been accepted, and the matter was remanded to the learned Maintenance Tribunal concerned.

2. In pursuance to notice of motion issued vide order dated 24.02.2025, Mr. Sangram Singh Saron, has caused appearance on behalf of respondent No.2, through a validly executed power of attorney in his favour. The same is taken on record.

3. Today, it is informed by the learned counsel for respondents no.2 and 3, that after the remand, the learned Maintenance Tribunal concerned, has again decided the issue vide order dated 26.05.2025, in favour of the petitioners, and order of eviction has been passed against respondents no.2 and 3, and now they have preferred a statutory appeal, which is pending consideration before the appellate authority concerned. Therefore, the prayer as made in the instant petition has lost its efficacy, and need not to be adjudicated at this stage.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners showed his agreement with the above contention of learned counsel for respondents no.2 and 3. However, he seeks that a *mandamus* to be passed upon the appellate authority concerned, to decide the statutory appeal in a time bound manner.

5. The aforesaid prayer is not opposed by learned counsel for respondents no.2 and 3.

6. Learned counsel for respondent no.1 submits that there cannot be a possibility of any objection, in case such a direction is passed upon the learned appellate authority concerned (respondent no.1).

7. In view of the consensus between the parties concerned, the instant petition is **disposed of**, with a *mandamus* upon respondents no.1,

to make its all endeavours to decide the statutory appeal, most expeditiously, preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

September 04, 2025

dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)

JUDGE

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