



CWP-10299-1996 (O&M)

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

201

CWP-10299-1996 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 26.02.2026

HARBANS SINGH AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

Versus

ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR, CONSOLIDATION, PB. MOHALI
AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. P. K. S. Phoolka, Advocate
for L.R. of petitioner No.2

Mr. Aman Dhir, D.A.G., Punjab

Mr. M. L. Saini, Advocate
For respondent Nos.3 & 4

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking setting aside of order dated 24.01.1996 whereby respondent No.1 has passed order with respect to land owned by parties.

2. The petitioners and private respondents were having property in joint ownership. The private respondents owned 1/4th share and petitioners herein owned 3/4th share. During partition, standard value of the land measuring 30 Bighas 8 Biswas was fixed Rs.4, 8 Anna and 9 Pies. After deducting area for common purposes and adding additional area, the value of partible land was valued Rs. 4, 5 Anna and 3 Pies. The respondents herein were entitled to 1/4th share and remaining belonged to petitioners herein. As per Resolution No.55 dated 18.07.1955 and Resolution No.160 dated 10.08.1955 of re-allotment, the



CWP-10299-1996 (O&M)

value of land was assessed and entitlement of parties was determined. Both the resolutions were duly signed by parties in the presence of members of allotment committee and their fields were separated during consolidation proceedings.

3. The respondents herein approached Consolidation Officer claiming that they have not been handed over land as per resolutions passed at the time of consolidation proceedings. The respondent-Additional Director, Consolidation by impugned order passed order of partition under the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948.

4. Learned counsel for the parties on being confronted with aforesaid facts concede that land should be handed over as well as allocated to parties as per aforesaid resolutions because there is no dispute qua aforesaid resolutions. The petitioner is primarily disputing impugned order on the ground that partition proceedings were pending before Assistant Collector Ist Grade. The respondent is claiming that partition proceedings were concluded by aforesaid resolutions and there was mistake on the part of Consolidation Officer while making entry in the revenue records.

5. In the backdrop, this Court finds it appropriate to remand the matter back to Additional Director, Consolidation to pass an appropriate order in the light of aforesaid resolutions. The fresh order shall be passed after granting opportunity to contesting parties. Let the needful be done within six months from today.

6. Disposed of in the above terms.

7. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

26.02.2026
SDK

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No