



COCP-1053-2026 (O&amp;M)

-1-

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

COCP-1053-2026 (O&amp;M)

SUKHPAL SINGH

...Petitioner

VS.

AMIT PANCHAL, IAS AND ORS.

...Respondents

Date of Reserve : 12.05.2026

Pronounced On : 21.05.2026

Uploaded on : 21.05.2026

*Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced?*      **No**  
*Whether full judgment is pronounced?*                                      **Yes**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**

Present: Mr. Baltej Singh Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with  
 Mr. Mehtab Khaira, Advocate  
 Mr. Himmat Singh Sidhu, Advocate  
 Mr. Mohobat Sandhu, Advocate  
 Ms. Mannat Khurana, Advocate  
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Anu Chathrath, Sr. Addl. Advocate General, Punjab with  
 Mr. Ravneet S. Joshi, DAG, Punjab  
 for respondents.

\* \* \*

**SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J.**

1. The present contempt petition has been instituted alleging deliberate and wilful disobedience of the directions issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Re: Directions in the Matter of Demolition of Structures (SC) (Writ Petition (Civil) No.295 of 2022 with Writ Petition (Criminal) No.162 of 2022 and connected matters), decided on 13.11.2024 and reported as 2025 (5) SCC 1.*

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that the respondents demolished a portion of the wall/gate allegedly forming part of his ancestral



residential property without adhering to the safeguards and procedural requirements mandated by Hon'ble Supreme Court.

3. In response to the allegations levelled in the petition, the respondents have filed an affidavit dated 22.04.2026 sworn by Kulwinder Singh Randhawa, Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Nadala, District Kapurthala, asserting therein that the action undertaken by the authorities did not amount to violation of the directions issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court. It has specifically been pleaded that the structure removed by the authorities constituted an encroachment over a public street/public passage vested in the Gram Panchayat and, therefore, fell within the exception carved out by Hon'ble Supreme Court itself.

4. Learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the respondents have acted in an arbitrary and illegal manner with the sole object of harassing and politically victimizing the petitioner, who belongs to the opposition party. He further contends that no notice whatsoever was served upon the petitioner before demolition of the structure and, thus, the action of the authorities is in the teeth of the binding directions issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Re: Directions in the Matter of Demolition of Structures (supra)***.

5. *Per contra*, learned Senior counsel appearing for the State submits that the petitioner was in unauthorized occupation of a portion of public land/public passage belonging to Gram Panchayat Ramgarh and the impugned action was confined only to removal of encroachment from public property. She further contends that the present proceedings are wholly misconceived inasmuch as the case of the respondents is squarely covered by



paragraph 91 of the judgment rendered by Hon'ble Supreme Court **Re: Directions in the Matter of Demolition of Structures (supra)**, wherein unauthorized structures existing upon public streets, roads, footpaths and similar public utility areas have specifically been excluded from the purview of the directions issued therein.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and have carefully perused the entire record with their able assistance.

7. Before proceeding further, it would be apposite to reproduce the directions issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Re: Directions in the Matter of Demolition of Structures (SC) (Writ Petition (Civil) No.295 of 2022 with Writ Petition (Criminal) No.162 of 2022, Writ Petition (Civil) No.328 of 2022, D/d 13.11.2024) reported at 2025 (5) SCC 1**. The same are reproduced as under:-

*“90. In order to allay the fears in the minds of the citizens with regard to arbitrary exercise of power by the officers/officials of the State, we find it necessary to issue certain directions in exercise of our power under Article 142 of the Constitution. We are also of the view that even after orders of demolition are passed, the affected party needs to be given some time so as to challenge the order of demolition before an appropriate forum. We are further of the view that even in cases of persons who do not wish to contest the demolition order, sufficient time needs to be given to them to vacate and arrange their affairs. It is not a happy sight to see women, children and aged persons dragged to the streets overnight. Heavens would not fall on the authorities if they hold their hands for some period.*



*91. At the outset, we clarify that these directions will not be applicable if there is an unauthorized structure s in any public place such as road, street, footpath, abutting railway line or any river body or water bodies and also to cases where there is an order for demolition made by a Court of law.*

**A. NOTICE**

- i. No demolition should be carried out without a prior show cause notice returnable either in accordance with the time provided by the local municipal laws or within 15 days' time from the date of service of such notice, whichever is later.*
- ii. The notice shall be served upon the owner/occupier by a registered post A.D. Additionally, the notice shall also be affixed conspicuously on the outer portion of the structure in question.*
- iii. The time of 15 days, stated herein above, shall start from the date of receipt of the said notice.*
- iv. To prevent any allegation of backdating, we direct that as soon as the show cause notice is duly served, intimation thereof shall be sent to the office of Collector/District Magistrate of the district digitally by email and an auto generated reply acknowledging receipt of the mail should also be issued from the office of the Collector/District Magistrate. The Collector/DM shall designate a nodal officer and also assign an email address and communicate the same to*



*all the municipal and other authorities in charge of building regulations and demolition within one month from today.*

- v. *The notice shall contain the details regarding:
  - a. *the nature of the unauthorized construction.*
  - b. *the details of the specific violation and the grounds of demolition.*
  - c. *a list of documents that the noticee is required to furnish along with his reply.*
  - d. *the notice should also specify the date on which the personal hearing is fixed and the designated authority before whom the hearing will take place;**
- vi. *Every municipal/local authority shall assign a designated digital portal, within 3 months from today wherein details regarding service/pasting of the notice, the reply, the show cause notice and the order passed thereon would be available.*

**B. PERSONAL HEARING**

- i. *The designated authority shall give an opportunity of personal hearing to the person concerned.*
- ii. *The minutes of such a hearing shall also be recorded.*

**C. FINAL ORDER**

- i. *Upon hearing, the designated authority shall pass a final order.*



- ii. *The final order shall contain:*
  - a. *the contentions of the noticee, and if the designated authority disagrees with the same, the reasons thereof;*
  - b. *as to whether the unauthorized construction is compoundable, if it is not so, the reasons therefor;*
  - c. *if the designated authority finds that only part of the construction is unauthorized/non-compoundable, then the details thereof.*
  - d. *as to why the extreme step of demolition is the only option available and other options like compounding and demolishing only part of the property are not available.*
- D. AN OPPORTUNITY OF APPELLATE AND JUDICIAL SCRUTINY OF THE FINAL ORDER.**
- i. *We further direct that if the statute provides for an appellate opportunity and time for filing the same, or even if it does not so, the order will not be implemented for a period of 15 days from the date of receipt thereof. The order shall also be displayed on the digital portal as stated above.*
- ii. *An opportunity should be given to the owner/occupier to remove the unauthorized construction or demolish the same within a period of 15 days. Only after the period of 15 days from the date of receipt of the notice has expired and the owner/occupier has not*



*removed/demolished the unauthorized construction, and if the same is not stayed by any appellate authority or a court, the concerned authority shall take steps to demolish the same. It is only such construction which is found to be unauthorized and not compoundable shall be demolished.*

- iii. Before demolition, a detailed inspection report shall be prepared by the concerned authority signed by two Panchas.*

**E. PROCEEDINGS OF DEMOLITION**

- i. The proceedings of demolition shall be video-graphed, and the concerned authority shall prepare a demolition report giving the list of police officials and civil personnel that participated in the demolition process. Video recording to be duly preserved.*
- ii. The said demolition report should be forwarded to the Municipal Commissioner by email and shall also be displayed on the digital portal.*

**92.** *Needless to state that the authorities hereinafter shall strictly comply with the aforesaid directions issued by us.*

**93.** *It will also be informed that violation of any of the directions would lead to initiation of contempt proceedings in addition to the prosecution.*

**94.** *The officials should also be informed that if the demolition is found to be in violation of the orders of this Court, the officer/officers concerned will be held responsible for restitution of the demolished property at*



his/their personal cost in addition to payment of damages.

95. The Registrar (Judicial) is directed to circulate a copy of this judgment to the Chief Secretaries of all the States/Union Territories and the Registrar Generals of all the High Courts. All State Governments shall issue circulars to all the District Magistrates and local authorities intimating them about the directions issued by this Court.

96. Before we part with the judgment, we must place on record our appreciation for the valuable assistance and suggestions given by Shri Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Shri M.R. Shamshad, Shri Sanjay Hegde, Shri C.U. Singh, Smt. Nitya Ramakrishnan, learned Senior Counsel, and Shri Prashant Bhushan, Shri Mohd. Nizammudin Pasha, Smt. Fauzia Shakil and Smt. Rashmi Singh, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners/applicants.

97. We also make a special mention of the painstaking efforts made by Shri Nachiketa Joshi, learned Senior Counsel in collating the suggestions given by all the different counsel.

98. We must place on record our appreciation for Shri Tushar Mehta, learned Solicitor General of India, who has presented the case in an objective and dispassionate manner in keeping with the traditions of his high office.

99. Post the writ petitions for further orders after four weeks.”

8. A bare reading of paragraph 91 of the aforesaid judgment makes it abundantly clear that Hon'ble Supreme Court consciously excluded from



the ambit of the aforesaid safeguards those cases where unauthorized structures exist upon public streets, roads, footpaths, railway land, river bodies or other public utility areas. Thus, before invoking contempt jurisdiction, this Court is required to see whether the structure in question falls within the exempted category recognized by Hon'ble Supreme Court itself.

9. In order to substantiate their stand, the respondents have placed on record the affidavit of Kulwinder Singh Randhawa, Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Nadala, District Kapurthala dated 22.04.2026. The relevant portion thereof is reproduced as under:-

*“5. That the averments made by the petitioner are incorrect, misleading and devoid of merit. The action referred to by the petitioner pertains only to the removal of an illegal encroachment raised over a public street/public passage belonging to the Gram Panchayat, which was causing obstruction to the general public.*

*6. That complaints were received from local residents regarding encroachment over the public street of Gram Panchayat Ramgarh. In particular, a written complaint was submitted on 04.02.2026 by Sh. Baldev Singh, Member, Gram Panchayat Ramgarh and Others stating that a gate had been illegally installed in the public street by Sh. Sukhpal Singh Khaira and Sh. Kulbir Singh Khaira, allegedly with the connivance of the Sarpanch, thereby obstructing the free movement of villagers, In this regard, the true translated copy of the complaint dated 04.02.2026 is annexed as Annexure R:- 6/A-T and its vernacular copy is annexed as Annexure R:- 6/A.*



7. That in the said complaint, it was specifically stated that the street in question is a Government-constructed public street and that the installation of the gate had created an unlawful obstruction in the public passage.

8. That upon receipt of the said complaint, the office of the answering respondent sought a factual report regarding the disputed street. Accordingly, the answering respondent directed the concerned Junior Engineer to verify the factual position and examine the relevant official record including the Measurement Book of Gram Panchayat Ramgarh. That in compliance with the directions of the answering respondent as discussed in Para 7, Sh. Ranjit Singh, Junior Engineer, conducted a site inspection and examined the official record. As per his report dated 13.02.2026 along with site map, the street in question has red bricks laid in it which were installed by the Gram Panchayat and the said street connects one street of the village to another, thereby functioning as a common public passage used by the villagers, In this respect, the true translated copy of the Report dated 13.02.2026 along with the Site Map submitted by Sh. Ranjit Singh, Junior Engineer dated 04.02.2026 is annexed as Annexure R:-6/B-T and its vernacular copy is annexed as Annexure R:-6/B.

9. The answering respondent also initiated administrative action and directed the Sarpanch of Gram Panchayat Ramgarh, vide its office letter No. 1170 dated 11.02.2026, to remove the illegal encroachment caused by installation of a gate in the public street, as mentioned in the above complaint and to submit a compliance report in this regard. However, it was reported that the said notice was refused to be accepted by the Sarpanch.



10. That thereafter another notice was issued by this office vide letter No.1172 dated 18.02.2026 to the Sarpanch as well as Sh. Gurdeep Singh, Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Ramgarh, directing them to remove the illegal encroachment and submit a compliance report. However, the Sarpanch again refused to accept the said notice. The Panchayat Secretary, however, reported that the Sarpanch had declined to pass any resolution for removal of the said encroachment and he does not wish to take any action against Sh. Sukhpal Singh Khaira.

11. That in view of the above conduct of the Sarpanch and his refusal to comply with lawful directions, the answering respondent, vide its office letter No.4341 dated 27.02.2026, requested the District Development and Panchayat Officer, Kapurthala, to initiate appropriate proceedings for removal of the Sarpanch from his post in accordance with law.

12. That further verification of the official record revealed that as per Measurement Book No.115 of Gram Panchayat Ramgarh, at Page No.3, it had been recorded by the then Junior Engineer in the year 2009 that the said street was constructed by the Gram Panchayat by laying red bricks. The said entry clearly establishes that the street was Public Street meant for the Public use.

13. That as per the said Measurement Book(MB), the total length of the street was recorded as 120 feet and the width as 14 feet 11 inches, thereby clearly confirming that the land in question forms part of the Panchayat street/Public passage. The report of the Junior Engineer further confirmed that the complaint submitted by Sh. Baldev Singh and other villagers regarding obstruction in the public passage was found to be correct, in this respect



*true translated Copy of the Measurement Book MB) is annexed as Annexure R:-6/C-T and its vernacular annexed as Annexure R:-6/C.*

*14. That the inspection further revealed that the structure in question had been raised unauthorizedly over the said public land/public passage. Consequently, the answering respondent initiated action for removal of the encroachment and necessary communications were issued to the concerned authorities including the Sarpanch of the Gram Panchayat.*

*15. That it is further respectfully submitted that the action initiated by the answering respondent has already been duly examined and upheld by the competent authority, i.e., the Director, Rural Development and Panchayats, Punjab, in exercise of powers under Section 199 of the Punjab Panchayati Raj Act, 1994. The District Development and Panchayat Officer, Kapurthala, vide its letter No. 808 dated 20.03.2026, had forwarded the letter No. 4450 dated 11.03.2026 received from Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Nadala, to the Director, Rural Development and Panchayats, Punjab, recommending the cancellation of the resolution dated 26.06.2025 passed by Gram Panchayat, Ramgarh. Upon issuance of notice and affording due opportunity of hearing to all concerned parties, including the Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Nadala and the Sarpanch of Gram Panchayat, Ramgarh, the competent authority, after considering the entire record, submissions, and material on file-including site inspection and Google imagery-recorded a categorical finding that the disputed passage is a Public Street constructed by the Gram Panchayat and is being used by the General Public, The installation of a gate amounts to*



*an illegal obstruction and encroachment upon a public passage, which may impede essential emergency services such as ambulance, fire brigade, and police. It was further observed that the resolution dated 26.06.2025 was not in public interest and had resulted in factionalism within the village. Moreover, there is no provision under Section 32 of the Act permitting closure of a public path.*

*Accordingly, the competent authority, vide order dated 02.04.2026, was pleased to allow the petition under Section 199 and set aside/cancel the resolution dated 26.06.2025 passed by Gram Panchayat, Ramgarh. Thus, the illegality of the encroachment and obstruction over the public street stands conclusively established by a quasi-judicial order and the action taken by the answering respondent is fully justified, lawful, and in strict compliance with the statutory provisions, in this respect true translated Copy of the Order dated 02.04.2026 is annexed as Annexure R-6/D-T and its vernacular annexed as Annexure R-6/D.*

**16.** *That is is further submitted that publicly available satellite imager, including Google Earth Maps images pertaining to the year 2012 and year 2022 clearly depict that the land in question was an open public street/passage with brick flooring constructed by the Gram Panchayat and was being used by the general public at large. It is further evident from the latest satellite images pertaining to the year 2025 that the said public passage and adjoining Public Area has subsequently been encroached upon by raising unauthorized structures, including a wall/gate, thereby causing obstruction to the public way. That in this regard true copies of the photographs obtained from Google Earth are annexed herewith as Annexure R-6/E and the*



*Photograph of adjoining Public Area specifically showing encroachment thereon are annexed as Annexure R-6/F.*

*17. That as per the record (including Map) of SVAMITVA Scheme of village Ramgarh, duly attested by the CRO, Bholath, it is clearly depicted that Road ID No. R003 (total area: 748.119 sq. mtr.) and R004 (total area: 211.964 sq. mtr.) are recorded as Public Passage/Panchayati Land, comprising a total area of 960.083 sq. mtr. (748.119 211.964 sq. mtr.). This further substantiates that the land in question forms part of a public passage meant for common use. That in this regard true Copies of the Record of Svamitva Scheme of Village Ramgarh have been annexed herewith as Annexure R-6/G.”*

10. A careful consideration of the aforesaid affidavit, together with the material annexed therewith, reveals that the respondents have produced substantial documentary evidence to prima facie establish that the land in question forms part of a public street/public passage vested in the Gram Panchayat. The respondents have referred to complaints submitted by local residents, reports of the Junior Engineer, entries contained in the Measurement Book of the Gram Panchayat, records under the SVAMITVA Scheme and satellite imagery reflecting the existence of a public passage at the relevant site.

11. This Court also finds substance in the contention raised on behalf of the respondents that the present petition has been artfully and cleverly drafted so as to give an impression of violation of the judgment rendered by Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Re: Directions in the Matter of***



*Demolition of Structures (supra)*, whereas, in substance, the dispute essentially pertains to alleged encroachment over public property and the legality of administrative action undertaken for its removal. The pleadings reveal a conscious attempt to cloak an ordinary civil and administrative dispute with the colour of contempt proceedings by selectively invoking the directions issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court while conveniently overlooking the express exception carved out in paragraph 91 of the said judgment with regard to unauthorized structures existing upon public streets and public utility areas.

12. The repeated references made in the petition to political rivalry, alleged harassment and registration of FIRs further demonstrate that the petitioner has sought to widen the scope of the present proceedings far beyond the narrow confines of contempt jurisdiction. Such an attempt to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court by employing ingenious drafting deserves serious disapproval.

13. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has, time and again, deprecated the growing tendency of litigants to misuse judicial proceedings through clever drafting and by giving a misleading legal colour to disputes which otherwise do not warrant invocation of extraordinary jurisdiction. The Hon'ble Apex Court has consistently held that such practices, if unchecked, erode the sanctity of judicial proceedings and ought to be "nipped in the bud" at the very threshold. Courts are, therefore, duty bound to examine the substance of the pleadings rather than the form in which they are couched, so as to prevent abuse of the process of law.



14. It is now well settled that contempt jurisdiction cannot be permitted to become a tool for settling personal, political or administrative disputes. The extraordinary power vested in constitutional courts is intended to uphold the majesty of law and ensure compliance with judicial orders, and not to provide litigants with an alternate forum for ventilating grievances which are otherwise amenable to ordinary statutory remedies.

15. Similar matter has already been dealt with by this Court in **COCP-3579-2025** decided on 24.07.2025 titled as “**Payal Chaudhary V/s KAP Sinha IAS and others**”, while placing reliance on the judgments passed by Hon’ble Supreme Court in case titled as “**Dalip Singh V/s State of Uttar Pradesh and others (2010) 2 SCC 114, Subrata Roy Sahara V/s Union of India (2014) 8 SCC 470 and K.C. Tharakan V/s State Bank of India & Ors. Passed in Writ Petition (Civil) Diary No(s).27458/2022**”. The relevant paragraphs of **Payal Chaudhary (supra)** are reproduced as under:-

“9. It is evident that the petitioner has engaged in what can only be described as a frivolous and vexatious litigation spree, seemingly driven by a misplaced sense of grievance. Such conduct constitutes a gross abuse of the judicial process and contributes significantly to the burgeoning pendency of cases before this Court. The tendency of litigants to misuse the judicial forum by engaging in forum shopping, filing repetitive and meritless petitions, and adopting dilatory tactics undermines the very foundation of our legal system and clogs the administration of justice.

10. The Hon’ble Supreme Court, in **Dalip Singh Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others (2010) 2 SCC 114**, has cautioned against this emerging category of unscrupulous litigants who, devoid of respect for truth, resort to falsehood and unethical practices in their pursuit of relief. The Supreme Court emphatically held that such litigants, who seek to pollute the stream of justice or who dare to touch the fountain of justice with unclean hands, are not entitled to any relief, interim or



*final. Relevant extracts of the same is reproduce as under:-*

*“In the last 40 years, a new creed of litigants has cropped up. Those who belong to this creed do not have any respect for truth. They shamelessly resort to falsehood and unethical means for achieving their goals. Courts have evolved new principles to curb such abuse, and it is now well established that a litigant who attempts to pollute the stream of justice or touches the pure fountain of justice with tainted hands is not entitled to any relief, interim or final.”*

11. *The petitioner’s conduct in instituting frivolous litigation has resulted in a gross misuse of the judicial process, thereby squandering the valuable time and resources of this Court. It is imperative, in the interest of justice, that bona fide and timely claims are adjudicated expeditiously, without being impeded by vexatious and unscrupulous litigation. At this juncture, reference may be made to the pertinent observations of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Subrata Roy Sahara v. Union of India (2014) 8 SCC 470**, wherein the Court lamented the pervasive malaise of frivolous litigation afflicting the Indian judicial system. The Hon’ble Apex Court observed as under:-*

*“The Indian judicial system is grossly afflicted with frivolous litigation. Ways and means need to be evolved, to deter litigants from their compulsive obsession towards senseless and illconsidered claims. One needs to keep in mind, that in the process of litigation, there is an innocent sufferer on the other side of every irresponsible and senseless claim. He suffers long drawn anxious periods of nervousness and restlessness, whilst the litigation is pending, without any fault on his part.”*

12. *The Hon’ble Supreme Court has consistently emphasized the need to deter frivolous appeals and petitions by imposing exemplary costs on the litigating parties. In Writ Petition (Civil) Diary No(s). 27458/2022 titled as **K.C. Tharakan v. State Bank of India & Ors.** decided on 01.05.2023, the Hon’ble Apex Court held as follows:*

*“No legal system can permit a situation wherein a party repeatedly agitates the same issue after it has been conclusively adjudicated by the highest judicial forum. Such conduct amounts to a gross misuse of the judicial process and results in a significant waste of valuable judicial time. Accordingly, the present writ petition is*



*dismissed with costs. However, taking into consideration that the petitioner is a dismissed employee, we deem it appropriate to impose a nominal cost. The writ petition is, therefore, dismissed with costs quantified at ₹10,000/-, to be deposited with the Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Welfare Fund, to be utilized for the benefit of the SCBA Library.”*

16. Applying the aforesaid principles to the facts of the present case, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has failed to make out any case of wilful or intentional disobedience on the part of the respondents. On the contrary, the record *prima facie* establishes that the respondents acted in discharge of statutory duties for removal of alleged encroachment from public land/public passage. The controversy sought to be raised by the petitioner pertains essentially to the legality and propriety of such action, which cannot be adjudicated in contempt proceedings.

17. This Court is, therefore, constrained to hold that the present petition constitutes a misuse of the process of Court and reflects an attempt to invoke contempt jurisdiction for purposes alien to its true object and scope. Such petitions not only consume precious judicial time but also subject public officials to unnecessary litigation despite their having acted in purported discharge of statutory obligations.

18. Therefore, in the considered opinion of this Court, the time has come when not only deterrent costs must be imposed upon the official respondents but also upon the frivolous litigants. If, in cases of genuine disobedience, costs can be imposed upon officials and recovered from their salaries, there is no reason why, in cases of manifest abuse of process such as the present one, the erring petitioner should not be saddled with exemplary costs payable to the affected officials.

**COCP-1053-2026 (O&M)****-19-**

19. Consequently, in order to preserve the sanctity of judicial proceedings and to deter misuse of contempt jurisdiction, this Court deems it appropriate to impose exemplary costs upon the petitioner.

20. Accordingly, the present contempt petition is ***dismissed*** with costs of ***Rs.6,00,000/- (Rupees Six Lakhs only)***, to be paid by the petitioner to the respondents in equal shares. The respondents shall furnish their respective bank account details to the petitioner, who shall remit the aforesaid amount directly into their accounts.

21. In the event of default in compliance, the amount shall be recovered from the petitioner as arrears of land revenue by the competent authority.

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

**21.05.2026***Saahil/Ayub***(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)  
JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned* : *Yes/No*

*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*