

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

**RFA No.23382 of 2018
Date of Decision:08.10.2018**

Sahi Ram ...Petitioner

Versus

Divisional Canal Officer, Faridabad and others ...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Kul Bhushan Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

G.S. SANDHAWALIA, J. (ORAL)

After arguing for some time, counsel does not press the present writ petition since he wishes to avail alternative remedy before the Superintending Canal Officer, under Section 20(3) of the Haryana Canal and Drainage Act, 1974.

Resultantly, the present writ petition is disposed of with the aforesaid liberty to seek alternative remedy before the Superintending Canal Officer in accordance with law.

It is expected that the said authority shall decide the case on merits since the petition has been preferred herein under misconception.

Ordered accordingly.

08.10.2018
pvd

**(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No