

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

**CWP No.6362 of 2019**

**Date of Decision:-27.03.2019**

**Gurcharan Kaur.**

.....Petitioner.

Versus

**The Director of Land Records Punjab, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar  
& Ors.**

.....Respondents.

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUM KUMAR TYAGI**

Present:- Mr. Jagraj Singh Khiva, Advocate for the Petitioner.

\*\*\*

**JASWANT SINGH, J (ORAL).**

Petitioner-Gurcharan Kaur has filed the instant writ petition, challenging the order dated 11.05.2016 (P-6) passed by Director of Land Records Punjab, who has dismissed his petition filed under Section 42 of The East Punjab Consolidation of Land Holdings Act, 1948.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has argued that impugned order passed by Director of Land Records is illegal and arbitrary and, therefore liable to be set aside, as the Director has not given any cogent reason for dismissing the petition of petitioner under Section 42 of the Act.

After hearing learned Counsel for the petitioner and perusing the paper book, we are of the view that instant writ petition is devoid of any merit and, therefore liable to be dismissed.

Admittedly, petitioner through her petition filed under Section 42 of

the Act had put to challenge an order dated 27.06.1995 (P-3), which was passed

nearly 21 years ago. It is not in dispute that the petitioner had raised allegations of bias by the Authorities concerned in favour of private respondents, without substantiating the pleas with any proof whatsoever. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner is not at all affected by the order passed by the Authority on 27.06.1995 (P-3), except by stating that she is a proprietor of the Village and a pro-rata cut was applied at the time of consolidation, out of which land has been allotted to Pawan Kumar-respondent no.2. Concededly, the said order dated 27.06.1995 (P-3) already stands implemented in the revenue record and respective parties have been put into possession subsequently. Once that is so, petitioner is bound to explain the delay in challenging a quasi judicial order. Merely by saying that she was not a party, would not suffice, especially when she was not at all a necessary party to the said proceedings. Even today, counsel for petitioner has neither been able to explain the inordinate delay in filing the petition before the Director of Land Records nor has been able to explain the delay while filing the petition before this Court. No proof of any kind is coming forth from the side of petitioner, which could substantiate any of the pleas raised before us.

In view of the above, finding no merit in the instant writ petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

( JASWANT SINGH )  
JUDGE

( ARUN KUMAR TYAGI )  
JUDGE

March 27, 2019  
Vinay

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether Reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |