

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

**CWP No.1160 of 2017
Date of Decision: 02.08.2017**

Sohan Singh

....Petitioner

Vs.

Financial Commissioner, Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: Mr.J.S. Thind, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J.

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 23.10.2002 passed by the Assistant Collector 1st Grade, Sunam, order dated 13.6.2003 passed by the Collector, Sunam, order dated 2.5.2006 passed by the Divisional Commissioner, Patiala Division, Patiala and order dated 1.2.2016 passed by the Financial Commissioner in the matter pertaining to partition of agricultural land.

In brief, on 3.7.2001, Amar Singh filed an application under Section 111 of the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 seeking partition of the land measuring 192 kanals 13 marlas. The respondents were asked to file reply and the revenue authorities were asked to send *Naksha Arra*. On 23.10.2002, the Assistant Collector 1st Grade passed the order observing that the petitioner has failed to bring on record as to how much less land has been given to him which is to be completed and the site plan 'C' was approved. Against the order dated 23.10.2002, the petitioner filed appeal, which was dismissed by the Collector. The Commissioner, while dismissing the

revision of the petitioner, observed that the objection on the question of title was declined and mode of partition was approved on 31.12.2001. The main objection of the petitioner was that he was not given land adjoining the road. It was found that since the petitioner has no share left, therefore, there was no occasion to give him any land on the frontage. The Sanad Takseem has already been issued and the appeal was filed after a gap of five years. The revision was also dismissed on the ground that the petitioner has nowhere indicated that as to how much area should be in his share. The Financial Commissioner has also made the same observation that the petitioner has not able to pin point that how much less area he had got which is required to be compensated. Ultimately, it was found that the petitioner has challenged the order of the Commissioner on vague assertions and the revision was also dismissed. Against the concurrent orders passed by the revenue authorities, the petitioner has filed the present petition in which he has again reiterated the same averments without pin pointing as to how much area has been given short to him which is required to be compensated.

Thus, in the absence of any material irregularity, there is no occasion for this Court to interfere in the order passed by all the revenue authorities and hence, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

02.08.2017

Vivek

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*