

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

RSA No.1617 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of decision : 03.11.2015

Desh Raj

...Appellant

Versus

Haryana State and ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment ?
2. To be referred to reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Ashwani Saini, DAG, Haryana.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Challenge in the present appeal is to the concurrent findings of fact, whereby plaintiff had challenged the order dated 26.10.2005 (Ex.P1) passed by the Assistant Collector, Grade-1, Narwana, order dated 28.02.2006 (Ex.P2) passed by Collector District Jind and order dated 20.09.2006 Ex.D1 passed by the learned Commissioner, Hissar Division, as the same were illegal and void on the premise that same were passed without serving notice under Rule 20 of Village Common Land Rules framed under the Act, 1961.

Both the Courts below have found that suit ex facie was not maintainable for want of jurisdiction in view of provision of Section 13 of Punjab Village Common Land Act 1961 as applicable to the State of Haryana.

I do not intend to differ with the findings rendered by the Courts below, much less, no substantial question of law arises for determination.

Accordingly, appeal is dismissed.

03.11.2015

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**