

234
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-2982-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 6.3.2018

Ramal Devi and others Petitioners
Versus
State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. G.S. Gandhi, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Ajit Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

1. *Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporter or not.*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?*

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 1.2.2016, passed by learned Additional District Judge, Rohtak vide which an application filed by the petitioners for amendment of the petition under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short 'the Act') was dismissed.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he had made twin prayer before the learned Additional District Judge, Rohtak. One is that an application under Section 13 of the Act is pending before the Land Acquisition Collector, Rohtak and he is not forwarding the same to the Court. It is stated that same has now been forwarded to the Court, therefore, the said prayer has become infructuous.

The second prayer was that the revenue authorities has not corrected the revenue record which was sought to be mentioned by way of amendment in the reference.

I am of the view that the Court is to decide only the reference made to it. If some revenue record is not being corrected, the petitioners should have approached the higher revenue authorities for correction of the revenue record and if still it is not corrected, petitioners can avail appropriate remedy. However, the reference Court cannot direct the revenue authorities to correct the revenue record nor any amendment can be allowed so as to widen the scope of the reference and decide the question which is not referred to it by the Land Acquisition Collector, Rohtak.

In view of above, no ground is made out to interfere in the impugned order dated 1.2.2016, passed by learned Additional District Judge, Rohtak.

Dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

6.3.2018
preeti

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No