

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-39160-2019

Date of Decision: 17.12.2019

Harpal Singh @ Palla and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Ajay Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

On the last date of hearing, the following order had been passed:-

On 13.09.2019, the following order had been passed:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioners
would place on record the Khasra Girdawari for
the land in question for the years 2016-17 and
2017-18.*

Adjourned to 26.09.2019.”

Thereafter, on 07.11.2019, the following order had been passed:-

“CRM No. 34570-2019

*“Pursuant to the order dated
13.09.2019, this application has been filed,
seeking to place on record 'Khasra Girdawaris'
from the year 1989-90 till 1993-94.*

*However, it is seen that the
allegation against the petitioner in the FIR
registered on 04.05.2017, is with regard to an*

occurrence that is stated to have taken place on 03.05.2017, the allegation being that the applicants-petitioners forcibly harvested the wheat crop of the complainant on that date.

Therefore, as to how Khasra Girdawaris for the years between 1989 to 1994 would have any bearing as regards the possession shown in the revenue record on the date of the alleged occurrence, is not understood.

Though no notice of motion had been issued in this petition, learned State counsel submits that a police official is present in Court today to assist him, on account of the 'Pairvi' cell of the Advocate Generals' office having sent a communication to the concerned police station, and as per the said police official, the possession, as per the revenue record, existent on the aforesaid date, shows respondent no. 2, Kehar Singh, to be in possession.

Learned counsel for the petitioner however seeks time to place on record the relevant 'Khasra Girdawari' and 'Jamabandi', as also a copy of the mutation entry showing the basis for any change in possession of the disputed land.

Adjourned to 21.11.2019.”

On 21.11.2019, none had appeared for the petitioners.

Today a request has been made on behalf of the counsel for the petitioners on the ground that the mother of the counsel is unwell.

Adjourned to 17.12.2019 for the last time, with the order dated 07.11.2019 repeated, and it made absolutely clear that if any request for an adjournment is made on behalf

of the counsel for the petitioners on that date, it would not be entertained, with the petition still to be taken up and decided on that date itself.”

Today, after seeking time on earlier occasions, learned counsel seeks to withdraw the petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

December 17, 2019
nitin

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE
Yes
No.