In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

Date of Decision: March 14, 2016

1. C.W.P. No. 4726 of 2016

Sawaran Kaur

.... Petitioner

Versus

Financial Commissioner to Govt. of Haryana and others

... Respondents

2. C.W.P. No. 4783 of 2016

Manjit Singh and another

... Petitioners

Versus

Financial Commissioner to Govt. of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH DHALIWAL

Present: Mr. H.P.S. Bhinder, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate,
for the caveator-respondent No.50.

***Paramjeet Singh Dhaliwal, J.* (Oral)**

Since, common issues are raised in both the writ petitions being C.W.P. Nos. 4726 and 4783 of 2016, they are being disposed of by a common order.

Both the above said writ petitions have been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 10.12.2015

(Annexure P/8) passed by the Financial Commissioner, Haryana, whereby revision petitions filed by the petitioners under Section 16(1) of the Punjab Land Revenue Act have been dismissed, as well as, quashing the order dated 02.11.2010 (Annexure P/7) passed by the Assistant Collector 2nd Grade, Rania, District Sirsa, whereby sanad taksim/certificate of partition has been issued.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners, as well as, caveator and perused the record.

The partition proceedings were initiated by the private respondents in the year 2006. Learned counsel for the respondent/caveator points out that the date for mode of partition was 05.07.2007, but it has been wrongly mentioned as 27.08.2007. The petitioners have purchased the land on 05.05.2009, 19.11.2008, 18.11.2009 and 16.12.2010 during the partition proceedings and after the approval of Naksha *Bay*.

It is stated by the learned counsel for the respondent/caveator- that in fact the partition proceedings were finalized on 27.08.2007, but the appeals were preferred by the various vendors. After finalization of the proceedings before the revenue authorities, sanad taksim has been issued.

The fact remains that the petitioners are subsequent purchasers and they will step into the shoes of the vendors.

In view of above, I do not find any illegality or perversity in the impugned order.

Both the aforementioned writ petitions are dismissed.

March 14, 2016 **[Paramjeet Singh Dhaliwal]**
vkd **Judge**