

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

121

CR-5896 of 2017

Date of Decision:01.09.2017

Sobha Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

The D.R.O.-cum-L.A.C. and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK.

Present: Mr.Ashok Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J.(Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against the impugned order dated 09.08.2016 (Annexure P-7) passed by the learned District Revenue Officer-cum-Land Acquisition Collector, adjourning the application of the petitioners under Section 28-A of the Land Acquisition Act *sine die* till the decision of the regular first appeal at the hands of this Court, petitioners have approached this Court by way of instant revision petition, filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, for setting aside the impugned order.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

A bare perusal of the impugned order passed by the learned Land Acquisition Collector will make it crystal clear that liberty has already been granted to the petitioners to get their application revived immediately after decision of the regular first appeals by this Court. In this view of the matter, no prejudice of any kind, whatsoever, has been caused to the

petitioners by passing the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld.

In the abovesaid peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, no fault can be found with the impugned order passed by the learned Land Acquisition Collector. It is so said because liberty has already been granted to the petitioners to get revived their application immediately after the decision of the regular first appeals by this Court. Further, the Land Acquisition Collector has rightly placed reliance on the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. It is also not in dispute that the regular first appeals are pending consideration before this Court. In this view of the matter, it can be safely concluded that the Land Acquisition Collector committed no error of law, while passing the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld, for this reason also.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners could not point out any patent illegality or perversity in the impugned order passed by the learned Land Acquisition Collector, which may warrant interference at the hands of this Court, while exercising its revisional jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. In fact, the impugned order has been found based on sound reasons.

No other argument was raised.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this Court is of the considered view that the present revision petition is 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, instant

revision petition stands dismissed, however, with no order as to costs.

September 01, 2017
seema

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No