

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU**

CCP(S) NO. 293/2022
In WP(C) No. 1922/2022

1. Purab ChanderPetitioner(s)/Appellant(s)
S/O Late Sh. Ram Dass
R/O Harsath, Ghagwal, District Samba
2. Suraj Chander
S/O Late Sh. Ram Dass
R/O Harsath, Ghagwal, District Samba

Through :- None.

V/s

1. Ms. Anuradha Gupta, DeputyRespondent(s)
Commissioner, Samba.
2. Mr. Ramkesh Sharma, Sub Divisional
Magistrate, Ghagwal, District Samba
3. Sh. Omi Raj Sumbria, Tehsildar Ghagwal,
District Samba.

Through :- Ms. Aparna Gupta, Advocate vice
Mrs. Monika Kohli, Sr. AAG

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE WASIM SADIQ NARGAL, JUDGE

ORDER

29.04.2024

1. The instant contempt petition has been preferred against the judgment/order passed by this court on 09.09.2022 alleged to have been filed by the petitioner in accordance with law and the rules occupying the field.
2. The statement of facts have been filed by the respondents in which a stand has been taken that the Sub Divisional Magistrate has constituted a Committee for demarcation of the land under Khasra No. 334 situate at Village Harsath, Tehsil Ghagwal, District Samba vide order dated 24.09.2022 and the Committee so constituted conducted the demarcation and the report has already been submitted before this court.

3. The respondents while filing the aforesaid status report have taken a specific stand that the status of Khasra No. 334 Village Harsath, Tehsil Ghagwal, District Samba is the same as it was on 24.09.2022 i.e. that date when the Commission submitted the demarcation report with respect to the aforesaid Khasra No. 334 and along with status report, the respondents have placed on record the report submitted by the Naib Tehsildar dated 25.11.2023.

4. I have gone through the status report filed by the respondents, a bare perusal whereof reveals that although a Committee has been constituted in this regard for demarcation of the land in question, yet the order which is sought to be complied with has not been complied with in its letter and spirit and the representation which is alleged to have been filed by the petitioners has not been accorded due consideration and no consideration order has been placed on record.

5. Confronted with the same, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents seeks just one week further time to comply with the aforesaid order.

6. In the light of the aforesaid backdrop and the assurance extended by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents, nothing remains to be adjudicated any further in the instant contempt petition and the same is disposed of by directing the respondents to accord due consideration to the representation alleged to have been filed by the petitioners dated 29.08.2022 in accordance with law and the rules occupying the field within a period of one week positively failing which this court will be constrained to initiate coercive measures against the respondents.

7. The petitioners however will be at liberty to seek revival of the instant contempt petition in case if the order mentioned supra is not complied within the aforesaid period.

8. The contempt petition stands disposed of in the manner indicated above.

(Wasim Sadiq Nargal)
Judge

Jammu:
29.04.2024
Raj Kumar

Whether the order is speaking?	Yes/No.
Whether the order is reportable?	Yes/No.

