

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9661/2026

1. Mr. Bhawani Singh S/o Sh. Manaram Purohit (Rajguru Brahmin), Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Revdar, Tehsil Revdar, District Sirohi(Raj).
2. Mr. Thanaram S/o Sh Bhagwan Jib Purohit(Rajguru Brahmin), Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Revdar, Tehsil Revdar, District Sirohi (Raj)
3. Maftalal S/o Sh. Bhagwan, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Revdar, Tehsil Revdar, District Sirohi (Raj)
4. Devaram S/o Sh. Galban Ji Purohit (Rajguru Brahmin), Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Revdar, Tehsil Revdar, District Sirohi (Raj)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. Ukaram S/o Narsaram Ji Purohit, Resident Of Revdar, Tehsil Revdar, District Sirohi(Raj).
2. Govindram S/o Sh. Galbaram Ji Purohit, Resident Of Revdar, Tehsil Revdar, District Sirohi (Raj)
3. Mahendra Kumar S/o Sh. Achalaram Ji Purohit, Resident Of Revdar, Tehsil Revdar, District Sirohi (Raj)
4. Talkaram S/o Sh. Achlaram Ji Purohit, Resident Of Revdar, Tehsil Revdar, District Sirohi (Raj)
5. Pratap Ram S/o Achlaram Ji Purohit, Resident Of Revdar, Tehsil Revdar, District Sirohi (Raj)
6. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Tehsildar(Revenue), Revdar, Tehsil Revdar, District Sirohi(Raj).

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Gajraj Singh
For Respondent(s)	:	

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEET PUROHIT

05/05/2026

1. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that, as a matter of fact an ad interim order has been passed in the second appeal filed by the respondent while stating that with regard to the land in question, cross suits are pending and therefore learned Board of Revenue has found it justified to grant status quo with regard to land in question as well as its record.
2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that as a matter of fact, suit filed by respondent has already been decided.
3. Be that as it may, after perusal of the record of writ petition, this Court finds that the suit in question has been decided *ex-parte* against the defendants and the learned Revenue Appellate Authority refused to entertain the appeal on merits observing that service upon the defendants was duly made and, therefore, the *ex-parte* decree was upheld.
4. Looking to the said facts, learned Board of Revenue has granted ad interim injunction in favour of the respondents – defendants while directing the parties to maintain status quo.
5. This Court is of considered opinion that when learned Board of Revenue has admitted the revision petition and granted an order of status-quo, the same is not required to be interfered by this Court.
6. After arguing for some time, learned counsel for petitioner does not want to press the writ petition on merits and seeks limited indulgence of this Court by directing the learned Board of Revenue to decide the pending stay application filed along with second appeal expeditiously.

7. The limited indulgence prayed by the petitioner deserves acceptance.

8. Learned Board of Revenue is directed to decide the pending stay application filed along with the second appeal expeditiously, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Learned Board of Revenue is expected to decide the appeal itself expeditiously, without granting unnecessary adjournments to either of the parties.

9. With these observations, present writ petition is **disposed of**.

10. Stay petition and all pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(SANJEET PUROHIT),J