

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

CWP-21450-2014

Date of Decision: August 09, 2017

SunitaPetitioner
Versus
State of Haryana and othersRespondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL**

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | To be referred to the Reporters or not? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? | Yes/No. |
| 3. | Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? | Yes/No |

.....

Present: Mr.S.S.Sahu, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr.Vijesh Sharma, DAG, Haryana.
Mr.Radhey Shyam Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.5-Gram Panchayat.

.....

SURYA KANT, J.

Learned counsel for respondent No.5-Gram Panchayat states that as of now there is no proposal to construct a *Chaupal* on the land which was earlier in unauthorised occupation of Rangi Ram and which has been got vacated from him and is now in possession of the Gram Panchayat. It is further stated that in fact the petitioner and her husband have an eye on that land and they want to take illegal possession thereof.

[2] In view of the above-stated categorical stand taken on behalf of the Gram Panchayat, the writ petition is disposed of as infructuous. However, no one shall disturb the possession of the Gram Panchayat over the suit land which has been got vacated from Rangi Ram. If there is any issue regarding the passage, the petitioner may approach the appropriate Forum.

**(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE**

August 09, 2017
meenuss

**(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/reasoned ? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable ? | Yes/No |