

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR

WP(C) 968/2024

CCP(S) 129/2025

MOHAMMAD IQBAL WANI AND ...Petitioner(s)/Appellant(s)
ORS.(SENIOR CITIZEN)

Through: Ms. Humaira Nabi, Advocate

Vs.

UNION TERRITORY OF J AND K AND ...Respondent(s)
ORS.

Through: Mr. Waseem Gul, GA
Mr. Nisar Ahmad Bhat, Advocate

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

ORDER

15-12-2025

WP(C) 968/2024

1. Mr. Waseem Gul, learned Government Advocate, submits that he does not intend to file the reply on behalf of the official respondents, as the matter pertains to an *inter se* dispute between the private respondents. His statement is accepted and taken on record. Ordered accordingly.
2. Response stands filed on behalf of contesting respondent No. 9.
3. None appears for respondents Nos. 10 to 14. Their appearance is awaited. In the meantime, they are granted an opportunity to file their reply, failing which their right to file the same shall stand closed.
4. List on 30.01.2026.
5. Interim direction, if any, subsisting as on date, shall continue till next date of hearing before the Bench.

CCP(S) 129/2025

6. By way of the present petition, the petitioner alleges violation of the interim order dated 08.05.2024 passed in WP(C) No. 968/2024, whereby, subject to objections and till the next date of hearing, status quo with regard to the subject matter of the property involved in the said petition was directed to be maintained.

7. Statement of facts/compliance report stands filed on behalf of the respondents. The respondents have taken a specific stand that the allegations levelled by the petitioner are factually incorrect, inasmuch as the land in question is under the possession and control of the administration. It is contended that, in these circumstances, the allegations regarding cutting of trees and violation of the orders of this Court do not arise at all. The respondents have further submitted that no such activity has been carried out on the land in question, which is under the control of the concerned Deputy Commissioner, and therefore the very initiation of contempt proceedings against them is liable to be dropped.
8. Thus, in light of the stand taken by the respondents in the statement of facts/compliance report and the admission on the part of the petitioner, this Court is of the considered view that no willful or deliberate violation of the interim order dated 08.05.2024 is made out. Consequently, no case for contempt is established against the respondents and the proceedings in the contempt petition are accordingly closed. Rule, if any, shall stand discharged.
9. **Disposed of.**

(WASIM SADIQ NARGAL)
JUDGE

SRINAGAR:
15-12-2025
Mubashir