



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

105+215

LPA-649-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 14.01.2026

Suraj Bhan @ Suraj Mal

....Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Mohan Sheoran, Advocate and
Mr. Balraj Singh Rathee, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Sandeep Chhabra, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Ms. Varuna Singh, Advocate
for LRs No.(i) to (vi) of respondent No.4.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 11.07.2022 passed in CWP-14432-2022 by the learned Single Judge, by which, the writ petition filed by the appellant has been dismissed wherein, the challenge was raised with respect to the partition proceedings.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant has only raised one argument that he has been given less than the share to which he is actually entitled which fact has not been appreciated by the learned Single Judge or even the authorities concerned.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent, on the other hand, submits that the said argument has already been considered and dealt with by the learned Single Judge and hence, the present appeal may kindly be dismissed.



LPA-649-2022 (O&M)

-2-

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

5. It may be noted that the area of land in question, which is being agitated to have been taken out of the ownership of the appellant, has been used for providing the *khaal* which is adjoining the land and the same fact has already been duly taken into consideration by the learned Single Judge. The learned Single Judge had further held that the said area will taken from the area belonging either to the appellant or to the respondent keeping in view the partition proceedings and the same is inevitable and therefore, due to the reason that same argument was raised by the appellant, it was rejected by the learned Single Judge.

6. The findings recorded by the learned Single Judge have not been proved to be perverted either on facts on record or on law and no interference can be done by the Division Bench qua the impugned judgment, which is not perverted. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

7. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed.

8. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

January 14, 2026
Varinder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No