

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

**Civil Writ Petition No.21055 of 2018
Decided on : 30.08.2018**

Shakuntla

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA

Present : Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

G.S. Sandhawalia, J. (Oral)

The challenge in the present writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is to the change of Mutation dated 07.08.2018 (Annexure P-10).

It is the petitioner's own case that the change has been made on the basis of judgment and decrees passed by the Additional District Judge, Sonapat dated 23.03.2018 (Annexures P-6 and P-7), but at the back of the petitioner, without impleading him as a party and he has a vested interest in the property in question, as the sale deed dated 03.03.2010 (Annexure P-1) is in his favour.

As per Section 13 of the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 (as applicable to the State of Haryana) there is a remedy of appeal from the order of the Revenue Officer, which lies to the Collector. It is settled principle that once there is an alternative efficacious remedy available under the statute and the writ Court would not exercise its extra ordinary jurisdiction under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India.

Faced with this situation, counsel for the petitioner does not press the present writ petition and prays for liberty to avail his alternative remedy.

Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of with the above said liberty.

AUGUST 30, 2018
Naveen

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No