



LPA-2212-2016

-1-

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

204

LPA-2212-2016

Date of decision: 22.12.2025

KISHORE CHAND AND OTHERS

....APPELLANTS

V/S

SUPERINTENDING CANAL OFFICER AND ORS

....RESPONDENTS

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

Present: Mr. Rai Singh Chauhan, Advocate and
Ms. Deepika Chauhan, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Rahul Rampal, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Saini, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (Oral)

1. The present appeal is filed challenging the order passed by the learned Single Judge of this Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 19312 of 2016 dated 21.09.2016, by which the orders dated 19.06.2016 and 18.03.2015 passed by the Canal Authorities qua the prayer of private respondent have been allowed and the irrigation of the land from outlet No. RD 47592/R, has been upheld.

2. Learned counsel on behalf of the appellants submits that once, even from the outlet No. RD 49565/L, the land measuring 12.9 acres was being irrigated, the same land could not have been transferred to outlet No. RD 47592/R for irrigation. Learned counsel submits that the learned Single Judge has not appreciated the fact that the transfer of the land from one water channel to another channel for irrigation is without any valid



LPA-2212-2016

-2-

justification. Hence, the same could be set aside and the order passed by the canal authorities be also set aside.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

4. The duty is casted upon the canal authorities to determine the appropriate water outlet from which the land of the particular farmer can be effectively irrigated. Once, after following due process, a request made for the change of the water outlet has been allowed, the same can only be interfered in case, the process envisaged is not followed and the same is causing prejudice to another farmer.

5. On being asked as to what prejudice has been caused to the appellants qua the change of water outlet from RD 49565/L to RD 47592/R, no such prejudice has been shown to this Court.

6. In the absence of any prejudice shown to this Court, the order passed by the authorities concerned which has already been upheld by the learned Single Judge needs no interference as no perversity has been pointed out to this Court.

7. In view of the above, present appeal stands dismissed.

8. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

22.12.2025

ankit

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes

Whether reportable:

No