



LPA1837-2017 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

LPA1837-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision :05.05.2026

Sat Rupa Devi and others

...Appellants

Versus

The Financial Commissioner, Revenue, Punjab
and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr. Vishal Pundir, Advocate for the appellants.

Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rai Singh Chauhan, Advocate for respondents No.3 & 9.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

CM-3946-LPA-2017

1. Present application has been filed for condonation of delay of 869 days in re-filing the present appeal.
2. Keeping in view the averments made in the application, which are duly supported by an affidavit, the application is allowed. Delay of 869 days in re-filing the present appeal is condoned.

CM-3947-LPA-2017

3. Present application has been filed for condonation of delay of 110 days in filing the present appeal.
4. Keeping in view the averments made in the application, which are duly supported by an affidavit, the application is allowed. Delay of 110 days in filing the present appeal is condoned.

CM-3949-LPA-2017

5. Present application has been filed for bringing on record respondents No.3 to 5 and respondents No.6 to 8 as legal representatives of petitioner No.1-Phulia Ram and petitioner No.2-Amru respectively, who

LPA1837-2017 (O&M)

-2-

unfortunately died during the pendency of the litigation.

6. Keeping in view the averments made in the application, which are duly supported by an affidavit, the application is allowed. Respondents No.3 to 5 and respondents No.6 to 8, details of whom have been given in para-2 of the application, are ordered to be brought on record as legal representatives of petitioner No.1 Phulia Ram and petitioner No.2-Amru respectively subject to all just exceptions.

7. Memo of parties is also taken on record.

LPA1837-2017

8. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 05.11.2014 passed by the learned Single judge of this Court in CWP-17979-1994 by which, the writ petition was allowed.

9. After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the appellants submits that as certain incorrect facts have been noticed by the learned Single Judge of this Court while passing the impugned order to arrive at a conclusion hence, the present appeal may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to file a review before the learned Single Judge.

10. Ordered accordingly.

11. Civil miscellaneous application pending, if any, is also disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

May 05, 2026

aarti

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes

Whether reportable : No