



CWP-21466-2025 (O&M) -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

108

CWP-21466-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 16.03.2026

Narpinder Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Gurmail Singh Duhan, Advocate and
Mr. Saijal Singh for the petitioner
Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to respondents to provide a path to their land.
2. This is second round of litigation. The petitioners, on an earlier occasion, approached this Court by way of *CWP No.3632 of 2025* which was disposed of with a direction to respondent to consider their representation. The respondent by way of order dated 16.04.2025 has rejected their claim on the ground of concealment of already available path to their land.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are willing to refund compensation received at the time of acquisition of land or in alternative are ready to part with another piece of land, however, may be granted path/*rasta* as claimed by them. The respondents cannot reject their claim for path on the ground that they are already having *Gair Mumkin*

**CWP-21466-2025 (O&M) -2-**

Rasta which is far away from the claimed path. The acquisition of land has resulted in closure of entry of main road in their field.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel submits that matter was examined at the level of Deputy Collector. Report was sought from Lower Authority. Physical examination was also carried out. As per report dated 16.04.2025, the land was acquired four decades back. The petitioners, at this belated stage, are raising question of passage just to take undue advantage. There is *Gair Mumkin Rasta* which is adjacent to land of the petitioners in which wheat is cultivated.

5. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

6. On the directions of this Court, Deputy Collector-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Rajpura has prepared report dated 16.04.2025. The conclusion of the report reads as:

“According to the report of the Deputy Tehsildar, Ghanaur and after the on-site investigation by the undersigned, it is proved that the ownership of Khasra No. 1267/355 (0-4) is in the name of Narpinder Singh, Virdevinder Singh son of Harbans Singh. The Mutation number 1471 and certified copy of division (Tatima) in the shape of Annexure-1 and Annexure-2 are attached with this order. In this Khasra number, Gair Mumkin Rasta is running, which is attached with the land of Narpinder Singh and Vir Davinder Singh, in which wheat is cultivated. The photograph of the Gair Mumkin Rasta is attached to this order as Annexure-3. The undersigned had called the petitioner on various dates as per above, but he concealed the fact in his statement on every date and also on 03.04.2025 that he had purchased Khasra No. 1267/355 (0-4) Gair Mumkin Rasta. In view of the above facts, the claim made by the petitioners Narpinder Singh and Veer Davinder Singh regarding granting of road to their land is rejected.

**CWP-21466-2025 (O&M) -3-**

7. From the perusal of above-stated report and arguments of the petitioner, it is evident that land in question was acquired four decades back. The dispute with respect to passage has arisen between the parties. From the record, it cannot be concluded that petitioners have no passage, thus, they cannot use their land at all. They may be facing problems, however, respondent is denying their claim. In such circumstances, it has become a disputed question which cannot be adjudicated while exercising writ jurisdiction.

8. In the backdrop, the petition stands disposed of with liberty to petitioners to avail remedy as permissible by law.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

16.03.2026

Mohit Kumar

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