

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.25805 of 2017
Date of Decision: 12.12.2017

Joginder Singh (since deceased) through Lrs

. . . . Petitioners

Vs.

The Financial Commissioner, Punjab and others

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: Mr.Gurjinderjit Singh, Advocate, for the petitioners.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J.

The petitioners are the legal heirs of Joginder Singh (since deceased) son of Kehar Singh, who are arrayed as respondent No.4 in the application for partition filed by Mohinder Singh/respondent No.5.

The petitioners are aggrieved against the order dated 10.1.2005 passed by the Assistant Collector, 1st Grade, Dera Bassi by which objection raised by Joginder Singh (predecessor-in-interest of the petitioner) that they have not been given land on the basis of its quality and thus the Naksha Arra is incorrect, has been rejected, order dated 5.8.2005 passed by the Collector, Sub Division, Dera Bassi, by which the appeal filed by the petitioner against the order dated 10.1.2005 was dismissed holding that the land has been given appropriately good out of good and bad out of bad after the spot inspection, order dated 21.5.2008 passed by the Divisional Commissioner, Patiala Division, Patiala, who has also recorded his satisfaction about the orders passed by the Courts below and dismissed the revision petition holding that the petitioners are raising objections without any cogent

reasons, only to delay the partition proceedings. It was also observed that the Assistant Collector, 1st Grade has also called amended Naksha Arra after considering the objections and visiting the spot in question and the order dated 21.12.2015 passed by the Financial Commissioner by which the revision filed by the petitioners was also dismissed observing that the petitioners have failed to cite any specific illegality in the allocation of land except raising some vague claims.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners, perused the record with his able assistance but could not persuade myself to interfere in the well considered orders of the revenue authorities in which objection of the petitioners have been thoroughly discussed and rejected.

With these observations, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

12.12.2017

Vivek

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No