

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

**RSA No.4834 of 2012 (O&M)  
Date of Decision.15.09.2015**

Krishan Lal

.....Appellant

Versus

Punjab State through Secretary to Water Supply and Sanitation  
Department and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Gurbir Singh Sidhu, Advocate  
for the appellant.

**CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN**

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

-.-

**K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)**

1. The only point that is urged in the second appeal is that an ACP granted which was against the Rules was not on account of any misrepresentation or fraud on the part of the plaintiff and therefore, the amount paid in excess could not be deducted. Although the trial Court granted the decree, the Appellate Court relied on the judgment of the Supreme Court in Chandi Prasad Uniyal Vs. State of Uttrakhand in Civil Appeal No.5899 of 2012 decided on 17.08.2012 and held that there could be no estoppel against regulations and if any amount had been wrongly paid in excess, it is liable for deduction.

2. I find nothing wrong in the judgment of the Appellate Court and I decline to make any intervention. The second appeal is dismissed as involving no substantial question of law for consideration.

**(K. KANNAN)  
JUDGE**

**September 15, 2015**  
Pankaj\*