

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-8971-2022 (O&M)

Jagroop Singh

...Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	15.01.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	21.01.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	22.01.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE LAPITA BANERJI

Present: Mr. J.P.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. Akhil Kamra, AAG, Punjab

DEEPAK SIBAL, J.

1. With regard to the petitioner’s prayer for grant of compensation in lieu of compulsory acquisition of his land measuring 6 kanals in village Thutianwali, district Mansa, in the light of the disputed facts which have arisen before this Court in proceedings initiated by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Indian Constitution, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw such prayer with liberty to the petitioner to avail of his remedy before the Civil Court, which we permit.
2. It is, however, clarified that while granting the afore liberty we have not commented on the entertainability/ maintainability or

**CWP-8971-2022 (O&M)**

2

merits of the remedy that the petitioner may avail in terms of the permission granted through this order.

3. The only other prayer made through this petition is that 16 kanals 15 marlas of the petitioner's land in village Thutianwali, district Mansa had been exchanged by the petitioner for 16 kanals 16 marlas of land belonging to the State as the petitioner's land was considered more suitable by the State for making construction thereupon for the police department. However, in pursuance to the said exchange the petitioner and the State exchanged possession but till date, in spite of passage of about 15 years the State has not permitted change in the revenue record to reflect therein the petitioner to be owner of the 16 kanals 15 marlas of land which the petitioner had received in exchange of his land measuring 16 kanals 16 marlas.

4. Since learned State counsel has admitted the afore exchange of lands between the parties there is no reason whatsoever as to why the revenue record should not reflect such exchange and it is so ordered. The State shall do the needful within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

21.01.2026
gk

(LAPITA BANERJI)
JUDGE

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