

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

S.B. Civ. Contempt Pet. No. 40/2024

Laxminarayan Vyas S/o Late Shri Sohan Lal, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Hospital Road, Kapasan, District Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Smt. Shyama Devi W/o Late Mohan Lal Vyas, R/o Old Udaipur Road, Infront Of Petrol Pump, Kapasan, Dist. Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.
2. Bharat Vyas S/o Late Mohan Lal Vyas, R/o 41, New Keshav Nagar, C Block, Near Pani Tanki, MIs University Road, Near Nagda Restaurant, Dist. Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Indra W/o Late Shri Ashok Vyas, R/o Old Udaipur Road, Infront Of Petrol Pump, Kapasan, Dist. Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.
4. Abhishek Vyas S/o Late Shri Ashok Vyas, R/o Old Udaipur Road, Infront Of Petrol Pump, Kapasan, Dist. Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Himanshu Shrimali with Mr. Harish Jangid & Mr. Dilip Thavlesha Mr. Laxminarayan Vyas, petitioner, present-in-person
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Narendra Thanvi, for respondent Nos.1 & 2 Mr. Manvendra K.S. Bhati with Mr. Vikas, for respondent Nos.3 & 4

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA BORANA

Order

28/04/2026

1. Petitioner Mr. Laxminarayan Vyas is present in person.
2. In compliance of order dated 08.04.2026, compliance report dated 22.04.2026 has been filed on behalf of the petitioner.

Therein, it has been submitted that the iron gate as erected on the site in question has been removed by the petitioner and so far as the room of respondent No.1 is concerned, it was never demolished. The iron shutter existing on the said room still exists. The photographs reflecting the shutter to be existing on site on the said room has been annexed with.

3. However, Counsel for respondent No.1 submits that all the household materials of respondent No.1 which were lying in the said room were thrown out by the petitioner and the situation remains unchanged till date. So far as the iron shutter is concerned, evidently, the same is not locked and remains open as of date.

4. At this stage, Counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, seeks permission to withdraw the present contempt petition.

5. The petitioner present in person undertakes that the possession and user of respondent No.1 in the room in question as it was used prior to the passing of the interim order, shall not be obstructed or interfered with by the petitioner in future.

6. In view of the above undertaking given and in view of the fact that the original position has been restored as of date, the permission as prayed for by the petitioner is hereby granted.

7. The contempt petition is **dismissed** as withdrawn.

8. Rule stands discharged.

(REKHA BORANA),J