

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

CWP-233-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 4.3.2021

Surender

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI**

Present: Mr.Mukesh Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr.Raman K. Sharma, Addl.AG, Haryana

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing in the light of the pandemic Covid-19 situation and as per instructions.

CM-3171-2021

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and Annexure P4 is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

Main case

The present writ petition has been filed for setting aside the order dated 19.10.2005 (Annexure P2) passed by Collector, Jhajjar, dismissing the appeal filed against the order dated 19.11.2003 (Annexure P1) passed by the Assistant Collector, 1st Grade, Jhajjar and order dated 26.6.2014 (Annexure P3) passed by the Commissioner, Rohtak Division, Rohtak.

Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to Mutation (Annexure P4) to contend that forefathers of the petitioner and now the petitioner is in continuous possession of the land in question. The claim of the petitioner has been rejected solely on the ground that some cutting was noticed in the revenue record. However, there is no material on record to conclude that the cutting was allegedly carried out at the instance of the petitioner. He further states that the petitioner's forefathers were in possession of the land much prior to Annexure P4 (Mutation).

These arguments have been correctly dealt with by the Courts below. The petitioner has been found to be in illegal possession of the Gram Panchayat land. We do not see any merit in the present petition.

Dismissed.

[JITENDRA CHAUHAN]
JUDGE

[VIVEK PURI]
JUDGE

4.03.2021

gsv

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No