

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

CWP-3841-2022

Date of Decision: 28.02.2022

Dhanraj

....Petitioner

VS

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

**Present:** Mr. Akshay Kumar Jindal, Advocate  
for the petitioner

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)**

The petitioner is aggrieved because his objections to the *Naksha Bey* have been rejected. Appeal and revision have also failed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the *Naksha Bey* is not in accordance with the partition. The land of the petitioner has not been provided any *rasta* and his land has been fragmented. Thus, the Courts below were in error in accepting the *Naksha Bey*. To show that the submissions are justified reference has been made to site plan Annexure P-4.

A perusal of the aforementioned site plan shows that respondent No. 5 has been granted a consolidated *chuk* on the road and the petitioner has been given land in consolidated *chuks* on both sides of road. The petitioner also owns land at various other places and it is difficult to accept that no *rasta* exists to the land which is at a distance from the major portion of the land. According to me, a perusal of the site plan shows that the petitioner owns a much larger share than respondent No. 5 and, thus, he has to be accommodated at different places.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has no answer to the question that if not the petitioner, who should get the land allotted to him.

No glaring illegality exists for exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction by this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and, thus, the writ petition is dismissed.

28.02.2022  
reena

( SUDHIR MITTAL )  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No  
Yes/No