



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

COCP-4732-2025 (O&M)

VARINDER SINGH SOHI AND ORS.

..Appellants

Versus

PARAMJIT KAUR AND ORS.

..Respondents

Reserved on: 17.02.2026

Pronounced on: 20.03.2026

Uploaded on: 20.03.2026

<i>Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced?</i>	NO
<i>Whether full judgment is pronounced?</i>	YES

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Ms, Avin Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, Advocate
for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

* * * * *

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 05.03.2019 passed by this Court in CR-3828-2018, whereby, status quo regarding possession was granted by this Court during the pendency of first appeal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that respondents have violated order dated 05.03.2019.

3. Per contra, learned counsel for respondents contend that the litigation involved in the present case is not only between the petitioners and respondents but between the petitioner and other parties as well for which another contempt petition i.e. COCP-2788-2022 is filed by the petitioner



which is pending before this Court. And the respondents have not violated order dated 05.03.2019 passed by this Court in CR-3828-2018.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the whole record of this case with their able assistance.

5. It would be apposite to reproduce the relevant portion of order dated 05.03.2019:-

“[6]. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that the status quo regarding possession would suffice to meet ends of justice during pendency of the first appeal before the Lower Appellate Court. However, it is made clear that the present order shall not be construed to be an opinion on merits of any pending case inter se between the parties.”

7. A perusal of Para 10 of the present contempt petition shows that the petitioner is making allegations against the official respondents that, despite status quo, official respondents have amended khasra girdawri. A perusal of the order dated 05.03.2019 as reproduced above shows that this Court did not mention the portions under possession of the parties while granting status quo. And the dispute in the appeal is between different parties and without any mention regarding portions under possession of the parties, this would be a disputed question of fact before this Court which can only be decided by the Court by way of evidence.

8. Therefore, the dispute regarding violation can be decided by leading evidence which is not possible for this Court.

9. Accordingly, the present contempt petition is **dismissed**.

10. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, are also disposed of.

20.03.2026

Saahil

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No