

227

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

**CR No.861 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 09.04.2019**

Vinod Kumar

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. K.S. Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Saini, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. R.S. Randhawa, Advocate
for the applicants [in CM No.20439-CII of 2017].

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral)

After arguing the matter for some time, learned State Counsel submits that order dated 30.07.2015 passed by the Prescribed Authority, Ellenabad [corrected vide order dated 02.09.2015] has not been put before the Tehsildar concerned, in order to enter mutation in favour of the petitioner. He further states that if the said request alongwith copy of orders is produced before the Tehsildar, the needful mutation shall be done within four weeks thereafter.

[2] The parties are at *ad idem* that this mutation shall be

subject to outcome of other litigations.

[3] Needless to add that parties in litigation would be at liberty to raise their grievances, whatsoever, in appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law.

[4] The Civil Revision Petition is disposed of accordingly.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

April 09, 2019
pankaj baweja

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes
2. Whether reportable	:	No