

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

**CWP No.10607 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision.12.01.2017**

Sukhjinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs

Superintendent Canal Officer and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Naresh Kumar Manchanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

The counsel for the petitioner has approached this Court against the impugned order (Annexure P-12) on the premise that no notice of motion or further date has been given in the proceedings initiated under Section 68 of the Northern India Canal & Drainage Act, 1873. After having acquired the knowledge of the aforementioned fact, instead of approaching the authority, he has straightforward approached this Court.

It is strange that once the order under challenge has come into notice of the petitioner, nothing prevented him in moving application for listing the aforementioned matter and moving any application for seeking vacation of the stay.

At this stage, Mr. Manchanda seeks liberty of this Court for withdrawal of the writ petition to take the remedy as noticed above. Ordered accordingly. The writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as aforesaid.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

January 12, 2017
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No