

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.16787 of 2016
Date of Decision: January 27th, 2017

Laxman Singh & others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

Present: Mr.C.B.Goel, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Mr.C.B.Goel, learned counsel for the petitioners contends that there is no order of ordering the mutation in favour of the Government, in essence under Sections 8 and 10 of the Punjab Security of Land Tenure Act, 1953. He submits that the Regular Second Appeal was dismissed on account of Civil Court having no jurisdiction. The impugned order dated 15.10.1982 (Annexure P-10) does not suffice the requirement of natural justice, in essence the petitioners have not been associated while initiating the proceedings under Section 12 of the Haryana Ceiling of Land Holdings Act.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and appraised the paper book.

The petitioners have not been able to explain the delay and laches in approaching the Court for correction of mutation No.1758 dated 24.11.1983, but filed the writ petition in the year 2016 despite having lost in

the civil suit upto this Court.

If at all, the petitioners are aggrieved, they are at liberty to move an application seeking review of the order qua maintainability of the suit, but not in the manner and mode as adopted. It is not a case of judicial review. No case for interference is made out.

Writ petition stands dismissed.

However, it is made clear that in case any application is filed, nothing observed in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

January 27th, 2017
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No