

110

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

**CWP-14635-2021**

**Date of Decision: 09.08.2022**

Iqbal Singh and another ..... Petitioners

*Versus*

Financial Commissioner (Revenue), Punjab and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL**

Present:- Mr.Armaan Gagneja, Advocate for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

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

During the course of partition proceedings, Sanad Taksim was issued which was challenged by the petitioner vide ROR No.312 of 2019. Revision petition has been dismissed and review has also failed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that post partition the petitioners have not been given good quality of land in accordance with their share. They have infact been given more of poorer quality land and this fact has not been appreciated by the Financial Commissioner. Reliance is placed on site plans annexures P-10 and P-11 to illustrate this fact.

On a comparative examination of annexures P-10 & P-11, I find that the argument raised is misconceived. Some changes have been effected post-partition; but it cannot be said that the partition is

not equitable or that the petitioners have been given more of poorer quality land.

The writ petition has no merit and is dismissed.

**09.08.2022**  
sanjay

**( SUDHIR MITTAL )**  
**JUDGE**

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether Reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |