



LPA-587-2025 (O&M)

1

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

(118)

LPA-587-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision : August 27, 2025

Vijender @ Bijender and others

.. Appellants

Versus

The Commissioner, Rohtak Division, District Rohtak and others

.. Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Ms. Tanya Vashist, Advocate, for
Mr. Satyawan Singh Nain, Advocate, for the appellants.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 27.01.2025 passed in CWP-32552-2024 by the learned Single Judge by which, the writ petition filed by the appellants herein challenging the partition, has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellants argues that the partition of land in question was not done in a manner required, which is causing prejudice to the appellants, which fact has not been appreciated by the learned Single Judge while dismissing the writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the possession of the parties qua the land in question was not kept in mind while effecting the partition of the said land, which is causing prejudice hence, learned Single Judge should have interfered rather than dismissing the same.



LPA-587-2025 (O&M)

2

4. We have heard learned counsel for the appellants and have gone through the record with her able assistance.

5. It is a conceded position that despite being served multiple times, the appellants remained ex parte qua in the partition proceedings before Assistant Collector Grade-I. Thereafter, the '*Naksha Kha*' was sanctioned vide order dated 08.04.2024 as no objection was received and thereafter, the '*Sanad Taksim*' i.e. instrument of partition was issued vide order dated 29.05.2024.

6. Once, the appellants despite service, failed to participate in the partition proceedings and eventually the partition which got done, cannot be objected by stating that the same is causing prejudice especially when at the right time, the appellants failed to raise any objection qua the '*Naksha Kha*'.

7. Keeping in view the totality of the circumstances, no perversity has been shown in the order dated 27.01.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge so as to need any interference of this Court in the present appeal.

8. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

9. Civil miscellaneous application pending if any, also stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

August 27, 2025
harsha

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No