

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14470/2025

Dinesh S/o Shri Sanwarmal Sharma, Aged About 41 Years, R/o
Lotiya Tehsil Surajgarh, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Ranjeet Singh S/o Shri Narayan Singh, R/o Jawani Singh
Ki Dhani, Jakhod, Tehsil Surajgarh, District Jhunjhunu
(Raj.)
2. Kuldeep Singh S/o Shri Ranjeet Singh, R/o Jawani Singh
Ki Dhani, Jakhod, Tehsil Surajgarh, District Jhunjhunu
(Raj.)
3. Hardevdas Nathmal Charitable Trust Lotiya, Through
Secretary Vikas Kumar Bairoliya S/o Pramod Kumar
Bairoliya R/o Pawan Filing Centre Daunar Road, Opp.
Holly Kosh, Post Lalbag, Darbhanga.
4. Hardevdas Nathmal Charitable Trust Lotiya, Through Co-
Secretary Ashok Kumar Bairoliya S/o Pawan Kumar
Bairoliya R/o Pawan Filing Centre Daunar Road, Opp.
Holly Kosh, Post Lalbag, Darbhanga.
5. Sub-Registrar, Surajgarh, Tehsil Surajgarh, District
Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
6. Tehsildar (Land Holder), Surajgarh, Tehsil Surajgarh,
District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
7. Amar Singh S/o Shri Lichhman Singh, Aged About 52
Years, R/o Lotiya Tehsil Surajgarh, District Jhunjhunu
(Raj.)
8. Atar Singh S/o Shri Lichhman Singh, Aged About 57
Years, R/o Lotiya Tehsil Surajgarh, District Jhunjhunu
(Raj.)
9. Prahlad S/o Shri Shankarlal, Aged About 45 Years, R/o
Lotiya Tehsil Surajgarh, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
10. Ranjeet Singh S/o Shri Ramkumar, R/o Lotiya Tehsil
Surajgarh, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Govind Sharma, Adv.
For Respondent(s) :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEET PUROHIT
Order

12/11/2025

1. The present writ petition is filed challenging the order dated 25.04.2025, whereby the *ad interim injunction* granted in favour of the petitioner ex parte on has been rejected.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that while granting the *ad interim injunction dated* 23.01.2025, specific findings has been recorded by the Court of Sub-Divisional Officer, Surajgarh that the prima facie case, balance of convenience and irreparable injury is found established in favour of the petitioner.
3. However, vide order impugned dated 25.04.2025 no reasons were assigned for vacating the ad interim relief already granted in favour of the petitioner.
4. As per the order-sheet, on the said date, the arguments were only heard with regard to the application filed under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC for impleadment of party, for which the time to file reply was granted to the petitioner. Even the services upon the other respondents were not completed by that time, in spite of the same, the learned Authority below has vacated the ad interim order by a completely non-speaking and unreasoned order and .
5. Challenging the said order the revision petition before the Board of Revenue, Ajmer was filed. However, the grounds prayed in the revision petition were not considered and the matter is remanded back to the Court of Sub-Divisional Officer, Surajgarh to decide the application under Section 212 of the Rajasthan Tenancy Act, 1955 (for short "the Act of 1955") within two months.

6. As a matter of fact, this Court is satisfied with the directions contained in the order dated 01.08.2025, whereby the directions have been given to the Court of Sub-Divisional Officer, Surajgarh to finally decide the application filed under Section 212 of the Act of 1955 within a time bound manner. However, it is also noticed that while vacating the *ad interim* order no reasons were assigned.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents are trying to change the status of the land in question and the same would result in multiplicity of the disputes.

8. In this view of the matter, the Sub-Divisional Officer, Surajgarh is directed to decide the application filed under Section 212 of the Act of 1955 within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It is made clear that no unnecessary adjournments shall be taken or be allowed to the parties.

9. In view of the facts that while passing the *ad interim* order dated 23.01.2025 the Authority below has clearly recorded a finding that a *prima facie* case, balance of convenience and irreparable injury found establish in favour of the petitioner, it is directed that the parties shall maintain status quo till the final decision of the application filed under Section 212 of the Act of 1955.

10. With these observations, the instant writ petition is disposed of.

11. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(SANJEET PUROHIT),J