

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

CWP No.8060 of 2003

Date of decision: 16. 2.2015

Giano and others

.....petitioners

versus

Commissioner Rohtak Divn.Rohtak and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr.Vikram Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioners

Mr.R.K.S.Brar, Addl.A.G.Haryana.

Mr.Harkesh Manuja, Advocate,
for respondent No.4-Gram Panchayat.

Raj Mohan Singh, J.

Brief facts of the case are that the land in question was *shamlat deh hasab rasab khewat* according to jamabandi for the year 1941-42 and was in individual possession of Chajju *hissedar*. According to *shajra nasab*, Chajju was shown to be son of Nihalu and the petitioner Giano was wife of Chajju. Other petitioners are also children from the family tree. Assistant Collector decreed the suit filed by the petitioners under Section 13 of the Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961 (for short 'the Act'), vide order dated 30.4.1999. However, in appeal, the same was reversed by the Collector vide order dated 8.1.2002 and the Commissioner

maintained the order of the Collector on 14.11.2002.

The controversy involved in this writ petition has been set at rest by way of a separate order passed today in CWP No. 7860 of 2003, titled as **Karma vs. Commissioner Rohtak Division, Rohtak and others**. For the reasons assigned in **Karma's case (supra)**, the instant writ petition is also allowed in same terms. Therefore, for orders see CWP No. 7860 of 2003.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

February 16, 2015
anita