



LPA-2496-2024

1

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

(231)

LPA-2496-2024

Date of Decision : December 09, 2025

Sohan Lal and others

.. Appellants

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

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

Present: Mr. S.S. Sahu, Advocate, for the appellants.

Mr. Aman Mittal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Karamveer Singh Banyana, Advocate, for respondent No.5.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 09.09.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in ***CWP No.22795 of 2024 titled as Sohan Lal and others vs. State of Haryana and others*** by which, the writ petition filed by the appellants challenging the order passed by the Canal Authority of including certain areas of the respondent from the Chak Outlet RD 50980-L, Sirsa Major Distributory to Chak of Outlet RD 1250-L, Shahidanwali Minor of Village Hizrawan Kalan, has been rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the appellants argues that the area belong to the respondents which has been sought to be included has not been examined with respect to whether, such inclusion would cause prejudice to the existing shareholders of the watercourse including the appellants.

3. On being asked to point out any factual averment or any complaint made by the appellant that after the transfer of the land of the respondents from a water outlet to another, there is a problem in irrigation or the land of the appellants is not being irrigated properly, learned counsel for the appellants has not been able to show any such evidence.

**LPA-2496-2024****2**

4. It may be noticed that as to how to land of a particular farmer is to be irrigated depends upon the decision to be taken by the Canal Authorities keeping in view the provisions envisaged for the said purpose. Once, the authorities have already transferred the land of the respondents from one water outlet to another water outlet and the appellants have failed to show that there is any prejudice caused to them upon the transfer of the said land to other watercourse, the Courts are not required to interfere. It is only in case any prejudice is caused upon an action taken by the Canal Authorities, the Courts have to adjudicate.

5. In the present case, in the absence of any perversity being brought to the notice of this Court coupled with the fact that no evidence has been brought to the notice of this Court that after the land of the respondents was transferred from one watercourse to another, the appellants have suffered prejudice, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

6. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

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

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

December 09, 2025
harsha

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No