



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

**CWP-18672-2026
DECIDED ON: 01.07.2026**

LAKHWINDER SINGH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Petitioner in person

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of directions to the respondent authorities to conduct fair and time-bound inquiry into allegations against revenue officials including Kanoongo and other officers for deliberate delay in mutation proceedings, reliance upon false and irrelevant reports, withholding of inquiry reports and alleged demand of illegal gratification for processing mutation arising from registered Transfer Deed dated 12.11.2024. The grievance of the petitioner is that Mutation No. 10958 remained pending for approximately nine months though mutation proceedings are required to be decided expeditiously within reasonable time.

2. The petitioner being owner/co-sharer in the agricultural land situated in Village Rajasansi, Tehsil Rajasansi, District Amritsar has executed a registered Transfer Deed/Vasika bearing No.2024-25/203/1/1008 dated 12.11.2024 in favour

of his wife, Manjeet Kaur. Thereafter the petitioner approached the office of Halka Patwari Rajasansi for sanctioning and updating Mutation No.10958 in the revenue record/Jamabandi related to transfer deed, which were though entered with the remarks that “Sir, the mutation may kindly be entered on the basis of the registry entry and submitted for the necessary action on 05.12.2024”. The same was forwarded to Naib Tehsildar Rajasansi with the remarks that “Sir, the previous entry is correct. The court orders entered in the remarks column of the Jamabandi vide report No. 552 dated 04/07/2024, No. 298 dated 03/03/2020, and No. 312 dated 02/01/2024 may kindly be verified. On dated 09.01.2025 ”. According to the case of the petitioner, the said mutation was disputed without any reasons with the remarks that “As per the report of the Field Kanungo, Rajasansi, the matter relating to the land area of Mutation No. 10958 is pending before different courts. Therefore, since the matter involves dispute and likelihood of conflict, it is beyond my jurisdiction, and the mutation is treated as disputed.”.

3. The petitioner submits that, with a delay of 8 months, the mutation entry was made by the Halka Patwari on 04.08.2025. He approached the respondents, including the Halka Kanoongo, who intentionally delayed the mutation proceedings and allegedly demanded illegal gratification of Rs.50,000/- from him for processing and approving the mutation.

4. Since the petitioner did not succumb to the illegal demands of the respondents, false and irrelevant objections/reports were incorporated in Mutation No. 10958 with the intent to harass the petitioner and obstruct the sanction of mutation.

5. The petitioner relies upon reports dated 04.07.2014/2024, 03.03.2020, and 02.01.2024 available with the respondent officials, stating that the same are

irrelevant to the land covered under the petitioner's transfer deed and have been wrongly inserted in the mutation proceedings. The mutation was updated in August 2025 after a delay of 9 months at the behest of respondent No. 8 – Sh. Deepak Mashee, Patwari, Rajasansi.

6. The petitioner has made repeated representations and complaints before the Deputy Commissioner, SDM Lopoke, Tehsildar Rajasansi, and through the Punjab Jamabandi Portal bearing Complaint Nos. 6485 (enclosed as Annexure P-1), 7176 (enclosed as Annexure P-2), 7416 (enclosed as Annexure P-3), and 7752 (enclosed as Annexure P-4). However, no decision has been taken by the authorities so far.

7. After the submissions made before this Court, the petitioner would be satisfied in case a direction is issued to the respondents/competent authorities to decide the aforesaid representations/complaints in a time-bound manner.

8. Notice of Motion.

9. Mr. Rajiv Verma, Addl. AG, Punjab, having been served with an advance copy of the petition, has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and assures the Court that the aforesaid representations/complaints shall be decided. The inquiry report, if any, prepared by the Naib Tehsildar/Tehsildar, as alleged by the petitioner and stated to have been withheld by the SDM Lopoke, shall also be considered while adjudicating the grievance of the petitioner.

10. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, the respondents/competent authority are directed to decide Complaint Nos. 6485 (enclosed as Annexure P-1), 7176 (enclosed as Annexure P-2), 7416 (enclosed as Annexure P-3), and 7752 (enclosed as Annexure P-4), after providing an

opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and by passing a speaking order within a period of eight weeks from the receipt of a certified copy of this order.

11. A copy of the speaking order so passed shall be supplied to the petitioner within one week thereafter.

12. The petition in the aforesaid terms stands disposed off.

01.07.2026

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No