

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-25105-2017

Date of Decision: November 03, 2017

Lichhmi and anotherPetitioners
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: Ms.Seema Arora, Advocate for the petitioners.

.....

SURYA KANT, J.

The petitioners are residents of village Manana, Tehsil Samalkha, District Panipat. Their grievance is against the letter dated 22.09.2017 issued by the Deputy Commissioner, Panipat whereby B.D.P.O., Samalkha has been directed to ensure that the land measuring 170 acres, which is stated to be owned by the Gram Panchayat, be not mutated in favour of the proprietors of the village and action be taken for the removal of encroachments made by the petitioners and/or other proprietors.

[2] We have heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

[3] We are sure that the impugned communication cannot be treated as an eviction order against the petitioners which can be passed only under Section 7 of the Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961, as applicable to the State of Haryana. If the controversy has already been settled, as claimed by the petitioners, they may approach the

appropriate Forum including the Deputy Commissioner, Panipat to recall/modify the communication dated 22.09.2017. Such a representation, if any filed by the petitioners, shall be considered and decided in accordance with law, within a period of two weeks from the date of its filing.

[4] The writ petition stands disposed of accordingly.

[5] Dasti.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

November 03, 2017
meenuss

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

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