

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CWP No.10522 of 2015

Date of Decision:-25.05.2015

GPC Technology Limited.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana & Anr.

.....Respondents.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ramandeep Singh, Advocate for the Petitioner.

JASWANT SINGH, J.(ORAL)

In the present writ petition, the petitioner is praying for a writ in the nature of Mandamus for directing the respondents to make necessary entries in the revenue record with respect to the new name of the petitioner-company for the record of rights.

The grievance of the petitioner is that originally the name of the petitioner-company was M/s Galaxy Power Cables Limited which was subsequently changed into GPC Technology Ltd., duly entered with the authorities concerned under the Companies Act. The petitioner-company is necessarily the same company which is registered under a new name and the grievance of the petitioner-company is that although there is no change in terms of creation of any new right and only the name of the company has been changed, the respondent authorities are not entering the new name in the record of rights as per law and thus, prayer has been made for directing

the Authorities to record the new name of the petitioner company in the record of rights instead of the old name.

After hearing learned Counsel for the petitioner and perusing the paper book, this Court is of the considered view that the present petition is devoid of any merit and the same deserves to be dismissed.

As per Sections 34 to 37 of the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887, a procedure has been provided under the statute for the persons aggrieved against such inaction on part of the authorities concerned for redressal of their grievances. In the present case, the grievance of the petitioner is that despite numerous representations, the name of the petitioner company has not been incorporated instead of the previous name of the same company. This Court, while sitting under writ jurisdiction cannot exercise its power Under Article 226/227 by directing the Authorities below to do their work, especially when alternative efficacious remedy has been provided under the statute. The statute, in its wisdom, has provided a mechanism for redressal of such nature of grievance. The petitioner has to approach the concerned authorities for redressal and not come directly before this Court.

In view of the above, finding no merit in the present writ petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

May 25, 2015
Vinay