

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

Civil Writ Petition No.2334 of 1994

Date of decision: 04.02.2015

Khaitan Hostombe Spinel Limited

... Petitioner

versus

District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Sangrur, and others
.... Respondents

II. Civil Writ Petition No.2346 of 1994

Khaitan Hostombe Spinel Limited

... Petitioner

versus

Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, State Commission,
Chandigarh, and others
.... Respondents

III. Civil Writ Petition No.2347 of 1994

Khaitan Hostombe Spinel Limited

... Petitioner

versus

District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Sangrur, and others
.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranbir Singh Pathania, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Raj Paul Kansal, Advocate.

K.Kannan, J. *(Oral)*

There is no representation for the petitioner when the matter is called. After the admission of the case on 29.11.1994, there is no representation for the petitioner even for a single hearing. Registry has reported that notice issued to the petitioner has been received back with the report that there is no such firm situated at the given address. No further steps are necessary in the absence of the petitioner. All the writ petitions are dismissed for default.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

04.02.2015
sanjeev

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.2346 of 1994

Date of decision: 04.02.2015

Khaitan Hostombe Spinel Limited

... Petitioner

versus

Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Sangrur, and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranbir Singh Pathania, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Raj Paul Kansal, Advocate.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

For orders, see Civil Writ Petition No.2334 of 1994 of
even date.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

04.02.2015
sanjeev

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.2347 of 1994

Date of decision: 04.02.2015

Khaitan Hostombe Spinel Limited

... Petitioner

versus

District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Sangrur, and others
.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranbir Singh Pathania, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Raj Paul Kansal, Advocate.

K.Kannan, J. (*Oral*)

For orders, see Civil Writ Petition No.2334 of 1994 of
even date.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

04.02.2015
sanjeev

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

Civil Writ Petition No.12331 of 2012

Date of decision: 04.02.2015

Malkiat Singh son of Kabal Singh, resident of 932, opposite
Gurdwara Sagran, VPO Adampur, District Jalandhar.

... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab through Home Secretary, Punjab, Punjab Civil
Secretariat, Punjab, Chandigarh, and others.

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Balram Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranbir Singh Pathania, DAG, Punjab.

K.Kannan, J. (*Oral*)

1. The petitioner who had been denied the benefit of renewal of arms licence, is aggrieved that the impugned order refers to the petitioner's conviction as under Section 25/54/59 of the Arms Act as the cause for refusal. Evidently, there is a mistake in not referring to the appropriate legal provisions viz. Section 307 read with Section 506 IPC under which the petitioner was convicted. I set aside the order and remit it to the authority to pass appropriate order making reference to correct provisions and still consider whether the conviction suffered by the petitioner would require to be dealt with by a suspension or revocation of licence in the manner

contemplated under Section 17(7) of the Arms Act of 1959. The authority, while passing the order, shall also take into account the previous direction issued already by this court in CWP No.4809 of 2011, dated 17.03.2011.

2. The writ petition is disposed as above. The decision shall be taken and communicated to the petitioner within a period of 4 weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

04.02.2015
sanjeev

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

Civil Writ Petition No.6788 of 2012

Date of decision: 04.02.2015

Smt. Sadhna Sharma wife of late Shri N.K. Sharma, resident of House No.7, Sector 11-C, DLF Model Town, Faridabad, District Faridabad, Haryana.

... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana, through Secretary, Department of Revenue, Haryana Civil Secretariat, Sector 17, Chandigarh, and others.

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Keshav Gupta, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. The counsel for the State points out to the fact that the dispute arose on account of the petitioner submitting for registration of a document that made reference to a transfer of one floor only. While the petitioner would state that there is no requirement that whole of the property must be purchased, the State was making an objection that there was also no instruction or rule that any portion of a building could be purchased.
2. There can be no fetter on registration in the manner that a party to the instrument wants it done so long as there is no breach

of the provisions of the Registration Act or there is no fetter on the purchase of undivided shares. A right in an immovable property can be transferred even with reference to a fractional share of the whole. The State's duty shall be to ensure that there is no evasion of stamp duty by deliberately making exclusion of property which is otherwise transferred. A transaction of sale of only one floor of a building will be perfectly competent, provided that the valuation of the building is proportionately worked out to a particular floor together with an undivided share of the land on which the building stands. The State will be entitled to make an inspection of the property and assess the correctness of the information and the details filled in the sale deed and if they conform to the requisite valuation as assessed by the State itself as per the circle rates for the value of the land and the PWD rates for the value of the building, the registration would be done on aggregate of such valuation.

3. The writ petition is disposed of with the above direction.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

04.02.2015
sanjeev

CWP No.26639 of 2014 (O&M)

M/s Vinod Kumar Sulakhan Singh and others
Versus
FCI and others

Present: Mr.G.C. Dhuriwala, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

CM No.919 of 2015

Application is allowed, as prayed for. Documents-
Anneuxres P8 and P9 are taken on record.

CWP No.26639 of 2014

The petitioners claim that the amounts of claim as
demurrage have been deducted by the Corporation without any
notice to show cause against such levy.

Notice of motion for 23.04.2015.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

04.02.2015
sanjeev

CWP No.11419 of 2012

Raj Kumar Chopra
Versus
UOI and others

Present: Proxy counsel for Mr.Amit Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta, Advocate,
Ms. Anju Arora, Advocate,
for respondents 1 and 2.

Mr. M.S. Rana, Advocate,
for Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate,
for respondent No.3.

Mr. Sunil Kumar Sahore, Advocate,
for respondent No.4.

At the request of the counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner, adjourned to 16.07.2015.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

04.02.2015
sanjeev

CWP Nos.615 and 24446 of 2012

Daljit Singh and others

Versus

UBHVN Limited and others

Present: Mr. Rishab Gupta, Advocate,
for Mr. J.K. Goel, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Pardeep Singh Poonia, Advocate,
for the respondents.

At request, adjourned to 16.07.2015.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of
connected case.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

04.02.2015
sanjeev

(207) CWP No.22810 of 2011

M/s Modern Rice Mill
Versus
FCI and others

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate,
for the respondents.

There is no representation for the petitioner when the
matter is called.

Adjourned to 16.07.2015.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

04.02.2015
sanjeev