SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPMS/2275/2018 Smt. Sumitra --Petitioner **Versus** Collector Haridwar --Respondent **Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.** There is no representation for the petitioner. 2. Mr. Suyash Pant, Standing Counsel for the State of Uttarakhand. 3. This writ petition was filed in August, 2018. Registrar (Judicial) pointed out certain defects in the writ petition, vide order dated 07.08.2018. Thereafter, the matter was listed before Registrar (Judicial) on two more occasions and petitioner was asked to remove the defects; defects were not removed. Ultimately, the matter was listed before coordinate Bench and coordinate Bench granted ten days time for removing the defects, vide order dated 14.08.2018. Defects have not been removed so far. 4. I have gone through the papers enclosed with the writ petition. Petitioner is challenging the judgment and order dated 08.05.2018, passed by Collector Haridwar in Revision No. 23/2015-16 (Gram Sabha v. Raghuveer). By the said judgment, revision filed by Gram Sabha Tanshipur challenging the order dated 16.02.2016, passed by Assistant Collector, First Class, Roorkee under

Section 122-B of Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act was set aside and order of eviction was passed against the petitioner.

5. The reason assigned for allowing the revision filed by Gram Sabha is that the land in question was recorded in category 6(4) in revenue records and it is a public utility land covered by Section 132 of Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act and no one can claim *bhumidhari* right over such land. It was further held that merely because the Land Management Committee had passed a resolution for allotment of land in favour of petitioner, will not create any right in her favour, unless an order of allotment is passed by the Assistant Collector, First Class as per Rule 176 of Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Rules, 1952.

6. Since petitioner could not produce allotment order issued by the Competent Authority, therefore, the revision was decided against her and order of eviction was passed.

7. Since District Magistrate, Haridwar has returned a finding of fact, which is based on evidence on record, therefore, this Court do not find any good ground to interfere with the same while exercising supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution.

8. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed. No order as to costs.

(Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.)
04.08.2026

Navin

NAVEEN CHANDRA