

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

* * *

CWP-26479-2017 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 5th October, 2020

Parveen

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

.....RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR
JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**

Present: Mr. N.D. Achint, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Dr. S. Muralidhar, J.

1. The affidavits dated 17th July 2020 and 22nd September, 2020 filed by the Land Acquisition Collector-cum-Sub Divisional Officer, (Civil) Pataudi have been perused.

2. The detailed demarcation exercise carried out clearly shows that three main reference points have been considered for demarcation of the land in Khasra No.21. It stands further sub-divided into Nos. 21/1, 21/2 and 21/3. It is now clear that the land comprised in Khasra No. 21/1 has not been acquired. To that extent, the Petitioner's assertion that he continues to remain the owner of land in Khasra No.21/1 is correct. In fact, Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, very fairly states that the Respondents would not be disturbing the Petitioner's possession as far as the land and structure in Khasra No. 21/1 is concerned.

3. However, the demarcation report reflects that apart from his possession in 21/1 the Petitioner appears to be also having possession of a portion of the land in Khasra No. 21/3 to the extent of 22 square yards and his co-sharer Raj Singh son of Braham Chand is in possession of 27 square yards in Khasra No. 21/3.

4. Mr. N.D. Achint, learned Counsel for the Petitioner, categorically states that the Petitioner is only concerned about the land in Khasra No.21/1, which he has

purchased through a registered sale deed and where he has a shop. He does not dispute the contention of the Respondents that he cannot have any claim with regard to land in Khasra No. 21/3 and the shops or structures found in Khasra No. 21/3 as shown in the demarcation report at E.17 and E.18 can be proceeded against by the Respondents in accordance with law.

5. In view of above factual position, which has come on record, no further direction is called for in the writ petition and the same is disposed of as such. The interim order is vacated.

(S. MURALIDHAR)
JUDGE

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

5th October, 2020
reema

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