

CWP No.14129 of 2017

[ 1 ]

\*\*\*\*

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

**CWP No.14129 of 2017  
Date of decision:06.07.2017**

|                            |        |               |
|----------------------------|--------|---------------|
| Pishora Singh              | Versus | ...Petitioner |
| State of Punjab and others |        | ..Respondents |

**CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain**

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.**

This petition is filed in order to challenge the orders of the Assistant Collector 1<sup>st</sup> Grade, Tarn Taran dated 24.07.2009, the Collector, Tarn Taran dated 30.12.2010, the Divisional Commissioner dated 12.12.2014 and the Financial Commissioner dated 29.09.2016 by which Sanad Taqsim has been prepared.

The Financial Commissioner has made the following observations while dismissing the revision petition:-

“4. I have considered the arguments of counsel for the petitioner and gone through the orders of lower courts. The arguments of the petitioner with regard to allotting inferior quality of land and less than their entitlement is not supported by any document. The argument with regard to non joinder/mis joinder of parties is also not tenable since it is not the case of the petitioner, rather the aggrieved party may challenge the same. The petitioner has alleged that the other co-sharers have also been allotted inferior quality of land, however, none of the other co-sharer has challenged the partition order. The partition

\*\*\*\*

proceedings have been completed and even implemented in revenue record. The scope of revision petition is very limited; reversionary authorities can interfere in only those cases where there is either any patent illegality in the orders of lower courts or where the authorities below exceeds its jurisdiction. However, the petitioner has failed to point out any such illegality. No interference is warranted in the orders of lower courts. Accordingly, the revision petition is dismissed in limine .”

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and could not find any reason to interfere in this petition as the petitioner has failed to make a dent in the concurrent finding recorded by all the authorities below.

Consequently, the present petition is hereby dismissed being denuded of any merit.

**July 06, 2017**  
vinod\*

**(Rakesh Kumar Jain)**  
**Judge**

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