

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

**CWP No.9416 of 2017
Date of Decision.03.05.2017**

Vinod Kumar KhoslaPetitioner
Vs
State of Punjab and othersRespondents

Present: Mr. Rajbir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

-.-
AMIT RAWAL J.(ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner had approached this Court for seeking appropriate direction for demarcation of the land and in that context, had also made representation. This Court had disposed of the writ petition with direction to do the needful. Having failed to do so, contempt petition bearing No.22/2017 is stated to be pending. Under the threat of contempt proceedings, respondents have fixed the date of 05.05.2017 for demarcation of the land but the allegation is that the Kanungo, who has been authorized to do the demarcation of the land, has colluded with other side.

In my view, the petitioner can always take all the objections at the time of demarcation and in case the demarcation, according to the petitioner, is not according to the factual aspect, his remedy would be to seek possession of the land by filing suit on the basis of preponderance of evidence by leading direct and cogent evidence.

With the aforementioned observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

May 03, 2017
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No