

CWP No.11927 of 2017

{1}

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

**CWP No.11927 of 2017
Date of decision:30.05.2017**

Hartej Singh and others

... Petitioners

Vs.

The Superintending Canal Officer, Ferozepur and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. B.S.Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. S.S.Sidhu, Advocate
for the caveators/respondents No.2, 3 and 8.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

During the course of hearing, both the learned counsel for the parties have arrived at a consensus that in case, the petitioners, who are aggrieved of the order of the Superintending Canal Officer comply with the directions contained in the order of Divisional Canal Officer by making arrangement of water course at their own level, the order of the Divisional Canal Officer be maintained.

According to Mr. S.S.Sidhu, Advocate for the caveators/respondents No.2, 3 and 8, the cause of action arose to them only when the petitioners herein deviated from the directions of the Divisional Canal Officer and erected a wall which is fortified from the report of the

Ziledar (Annexure P-3).

Be that as it may, the fact remains that once Mr. B.S.Sidhu, learned counsel for the petitioners made a statement that they will comply with the order of the Divisional Canal Officer by making arrangement for supply of water from the outlet carved out for the first two acres of land, the order of the Superintending Canal Officer would not come in their way.

Resultantly, the writ petition is disposed of. In case, the petitioners comply with the directions contained in the order of the Divisional Canal Officer, the order of the Superintending Canal Officer setting aside the order of the Divisional Canal Officer shall not come in their way.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 30, 2017
savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No