

257

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 8077 of 2017 (O/M)
Date of decision : 25.4.2018

Angoori Devi

..... Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Jainendra Gurukul

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. S.S. Toor, Advocate,
for petitioner.

Mr. S.K. Jain and Mr. Ashima Jain, Advocates,
for respondent.

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 present revision is order dated 17.10.2017, passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panchkula, vide which application to appoint HUDA staff to demarcate the land was dismissed on the ground that they are not in better position than the Kanungo, Panchkula, to demarcate the land.

I have heard the learned counsels for parties and have also carefully gone through file.

It comes out that earlier Kanungo was appointed as a Local Commissioner to demarcate the land. The learned counsel for petitioner contends that Kanungo, Revenue, reported that three pucca points could not be found, but according to learned counsel for petitioner, pucca points are there and Estate Officer, HUDA, be appointed as a Local Commissioner.

CR No. 8077 of 2017 (O/M)

I am of the view that Revenue Officer is more competent to demarcate the land than the Estate Officer, HUDA. If according to petitioner, Kanungo could not find pucca points, he could file objections to report of Local Commissioner and seek fresh visit of Kanungo for demarcation of land. There is absolute no ground to appoint Estate Officer, HUDA, as a Local Commissioner in this case. Consequently, revision is dismissed. Since main case is dismissed, therefore, pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

25.4.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No

Whether Reportable : Yes / No