

CWP-17627-2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-17627-2018

Date of Decision: 3rd October, 2019

Balwan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

Challenge in this writ petition is to the order dated 26.09.2017 (Annexure P-12) passed by the Financial Commissioner-cum-Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue, Haryana – respondent No.1, order dated 12.06.2014 (Annexure P-11), whereby, *sanad taksim* has been issued by the Assistant Collector 1st Grade, order dated 28.08.2015 (Annexure P-9) passed by the Commissioner, Ambala Division, Ambala – respondent No.2, order dated 13.02.2014 (Annexure P-7) passed by the Collector, Kaithal – respondent No.3 and order dated 02.05.2013 (Annexure P-6) passed by the Assistant Collector 1st Grade, Sub Tehsil Dhand, District Kaithal – respondent No.4.

2. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the land measuring 15 marlas is at the higher level, because of which, it is not possible for the petitioner to irrigate and cultivate the same. He, thus, contends that the land which has been given to the share of the petitioner

being uncultivable would not be of any use of the petitioner and therefore, the petitioner has suffered a loss on the nature and quality of land as well as utility thereof. He, therefore, prays that the impugned orders cannot sustain and deserve to be set aside.

3. This contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner, on consideration, has been found to be not supported by any of the revenue record. In the absence of any revenue record to substantiate such a contention as has been sought to be raised by the petitioner, the same cannot be accepted. The orders as passed by the authorities which are under challenge in the present writ petition being based upon proper appreciation of the pleadings and the records available, do not call for any interference by this Court in exercise of its writ jurisdiction.

4. The writ petition, therefore, stands dismissed.

3rd October, 2019
Harish

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No