

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

**L.P.A.No.1451 of 2016 (O&M) in
Civil Writ Petition No.19893 of 2014
Date of Decision: July 20, 2018**

Veerpal Singh

...Appellant

Versus

The Superintending Canal Officer & others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL**

**Present: Mr. Baltej Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the appellant.**

Mr. Pankaj Gupta, Addl.A.G.Punjab.

**Mr. S.K.Arora, Advocate,
for respondent Nos.5 & 6.**

AMIT RAWAL, J.

Present intra-court appeal has been preferred at the instance of Veerpal Singh. He was not a party to the lis before the learned Single Bench in Civil Writ Petition No.19893 of 2014. No application seeking permission of this Court to file the appeal has been filed. Even writ petitioner Jalandhar Singh had also not been impleaded as a party.

Jalandhar Singh had preferred a writ petition seeking quashing of the orders dated 28.7.2014 (Annexure P-3) passed by the Superintending Canal Officer, Ferozepur Canal Circle and 1.10.2013 (Annexure P-2) of Divisional Canal Officer, Abohar Canal Division for stopping the transfer of the area of Outlet No.7265-TF Warring Sarai Naga Sub Minor, Faridkot

Canal Division to Lift Pump Outlet No.218515-L Sirhind Feeder, Abohar Canal Division. The authorities sanctioned the Lift Pump at RD of Sirhind Feeder for their area measuring 167.60 acres vide order dated 27.9.2005 (Annexure P-1). For this purpose, the Society had been constituted and registered in the name of late S.Sunder Singh Jal Paryog Society, therefore, in such circumstances, the petitioner could not submit the application directly to the authorities for sanctioning of the Lift Pump. Such application should have been routed through the Society. This is what the grievance in short before this Court.

We are afraid, the aforementioned grievance cannot be adjudicated in view of the ambiguity in the Letters Patent Appeal and the remedy, if any, lied elsewhere.

We do not find any illegality or perversity in the order of the learned Single Bench. No ground for interference is made out. Resultantly, the Letters Patent Appeal is dismissed. Consequently, the application for condonation of delay of 28 days in filing the appeal is also dismissed.

(RAJESH BINDAL)
JUDGE

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

July 20, 2018
ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No