IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Letters Patent Appeal No.2033 of 2014 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 22.01.2015

Shanker Saini .....Appellant

versus

Lokayukta, Haryana and others .....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.J.VAZIFDAR, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. V.B. Aggarwal, Advocate for the appellant

..

S.J.VAZIFDAR, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral):

There is no warrant for interfering with the impugned order especially at the instance of the appellant who is the original petitioner.

2. The appellant has made serious allegations against respondents No.9 and 10. He contends that a sale deed had been executed by a third party in favour of five persons including respondent No.10. He states that the names of three of these persons were deleted wrongly in the sale deed as a result whereof the property vested only in the remaining two purchasers, namely, respondent No.10 and another party. The fifth purchaser has not even been impleaded in the writ petition although any order in the appellant's favour would affect him adversely.

The appellant submits that what actually ought to have been done was for the parties to have executed a fresh sale deed transferring the shares of three purchasers whose names have been

PARKASH CHAND
2015.01.23 16:59
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

deleted in favour of respondent No.10 and the remaining purchasers.

3. The appellant has no concern whatsoever with the entire transaction. He is a stranger to the sale deed. He claims to be a public-spirited person whose only intention is to save the government revenue. A complaint was filed before the Lokayukta who by an order dated 18.12.2012 recommended that the competent authority should initiate departmental enquiry and also launch criminal prosecution against the Registry Clerk i.e. respondent No.9 as well as the purchasers and others found involved in tampering with the official record maintained in the office of the Sub-Registrar/Tehsildar.

4. A departmental enquiry was thereafter conducted against respondent No.9, the Registry Clerk whose explanation was accepted. The order sets out the facts and considers them in sufficient detail. The order cannot be said to be absurd or unsustainable.

We see no reason to take any further action in the matter especially at the instance of the appellant/original petitioner.

5. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed.

(S.J. VAZIFDAR)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

22.01.2015
parkash*

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE

PARKASH CHAND
2015.01.23 16:59
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

PARKASH CHAND
2015.01.23 16:59
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document