

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.24952 of 2013

Date of decision:2.12.2016

Major Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Superintending Canal Officer, Patiala Circle IB Patiala and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: None for the petitioners.
Mr.B.M.Vinayak, DAG, Punjab.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against the order dated 30.9.2013 passed by the Superintending Canal Officer, Patiala Circle IB Patiala, whereby appeal of the petitioner was dismissed, upholding the orders passed by the subordinate canal authorities, shifting some area from one outlet to another outlet in the interest of better irrigation, petitioners have approached this Court by way of present writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of certiorari, for quashing the impugned orders.

Notice of motion was issued. However, no interim order was passed. The respondents appeared and filed their respective written statements. No replication was filed by the petitioners.

Heard learned counsel for the State.

Since there was no interim order passed by this Court, the impugned orders would have stood implemented at the site long back. None appeared on behalf of the petitioners on 14.7.2016 and the case was adjourned for today. Similar is the position today. Nobody has come on behalf of the petitioners to press this petition.

A combined reading of the impugned orders passed by the respondent canal authorities would make it crystal clear that none of the impugned orders is suffering from any patent illegality or perversity. Neither respondent No.2 nor respondent No.1 have exceeded their jurisdiction, while passing their respective impugned orders. Further, no prejudice of any kind, whatsoever, has been caused to the petitioners, by passing the impugned orders. Since the canal authorities are expert in their line, this Court would be slow to interfere in the orders passed by the expert authorities, unless the impugned orders passed by the canal authorities are found suffering from patent illegality and perversity.

In view of the above, the instant writ petition has been found wholly misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, it must fail. No case for interference has been made out.

Resultantly, with the above-said observations made, the instant writ petition stands dismissed, however, with no order as to costs.

2.12.2016
mks

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No