

**Bhagat Ram Vs. Jatin & Ors.**

**COPC No. 1092/2025**

01.04.2026

Present: Mr. Mohit Jaitak, Advocate (through VC),  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manoj Chauhan, Additional Advocate  
General, for respondents No. 1 & 2/State.

Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate, for  
respondent No. 3.

In the reply filed by respondent No. 1 it has been stated that State Government is the owner of the suit land and respondent Bhagat Ram has continued to unauthorizedly occupy the suit land and he has constructed structures on it in violation of original terms of allotment. It has further been stated in the reply that as per records available in the office of replying respondent, there is no Government Policy for regularization of the Government land and District Collector has no power to regularize unauthorized possession over the Government land.

Be it stated that, a Coordinate Bench of this Court has passed the judgment under reference and directed the respondents to regularize the structure in favour of the petitioner in case he deposits a sum of Rs. 13 lacs in *toto* towards unauthorized occupation of the land in question, which admittedly has been deposited by the petitioner.

...2...

However, thereafter the respondents went to Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing an SLP, wherein, it was brought to the notice of Hon'ble Supreme Court that the petitioner ought to have been directed to deposit a sum of Rs. 18,13,232/-, instead of Rs. 13 lacs and the Hon'ble Supreme Court disposed of the petition and directed the petitioner to deposit the balance amount within a period of six weeks. Now the balance amount has also been deposited by the petitioner. However, despite deposit of the balance amount of Rs. 18,13,232/-, as directed, the respondents have not complied with the judgment under reference and instead took the aforesaid plea that District Collector has no power to regularize unauthorized possession over the Government land.

Admittedly, the judgment passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court has been affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the same has attained finality, thus, it does not lie in the mouth of the respondents that they cannot comply with the same. The action of the respondents *prima facie* amounts to willful disobedience of the Court orders. However, before passing any adverse

....3....

order against the respondents, one final opportunity of four weeks' is granted to them to comply with the judgment under reference, which has attained finality upto the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

As prayed, list for compliance on **04.05.2026**, failing which, all the respondents shall personally appear before this Court on the date fixed.

**( Sushil Kukreja )**  
**Judge**

**1<sup>st</sup> April, 2026**  
(raman)