

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

CWP No.7161 of 2017
Date of Decision.06.04.2017

Dhanno Devi

.....Petitioner

Vs

The Financial Commissioner Revenue and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Jaideep Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Chauhan, Advocate
for the caveators-private respondents No.4 to 6.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

-:-

AMIT RAWAL J.(ORAL)

Notice of motion.

Mr. R.S. Chauhan, Advocate accepts notice for respondents
No.4 to 6.

Both the parties are ad idem that with the mode of partition suggesting the passage to the private respondents, in fact is one purchased by the petitioner which is shown in site plan plan Annexure P-2 in red colour. Most of it is adjoining the land of Makhan Singh and part of it of petitioner whereas the passage which is being used or envisaged is on the other side i.e. southern side of the site plan.

Mr. R.S. Chauhan, on instructions from his clients i.e. the private respondents, submits that they will not destroy the trees on the passage which he has purchased and provided in partition.

With the aforementioned undertaking, the grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition qua removal of the trees is addressed.

With the aforementioned undertaking of the parties, the writ petition is disposed of by upholding the orders under challenge.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

April 06, 2017
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No