



CWP-32987-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

120

CWP-32987-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.02.2026

Chittar Singh

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARSH BUNGER J. (Oral)

1 Petition herein is, *inter alia*, seeking a writ in the nature of Certiorari, for setting aside the order dated 01.04.2025 (Annexure P-7) passed by learned Financial Commissioner, Haryana, whereby the revision petition filed by the petitioner against the partition proceedings/*Sanad Takseem* has been dismissed.

2. Briefly, petitioner along with respondents No.6 to 19 sought partition of joint land comprised in Khewat No.234/201min, Khewat No.238, Khewat No.239 and Khewat No.240, situated at village Rajgarh, Tehsil and District Bhiwani (as per *jamabandi* for the year 2008-09). In the aforesaid partition proceedings, the mode of partition was prepared and thereafter *Naksha Kha* and *Naksha Jeem* were also prepared and approved and the partition proceedings concluded with the drawing of *Sanad Takseem* dated 17.01.2013 (Annexure P-2).



2.1 The aforesaid partition proceedings are stated to have been challenged before the learned Collector, Bhiwani, who vide order dated 23.12.2016 (Annexure P-4) remanded the matter to the learned Assistant Collector, Bhiwani for deciding the partition proceedings afresh. Thereafter, the respondents No.6 to 10, 11 & 13 are stated to have filed an appeal before the learned Commissioner, Rohtak Division, Rohtak, which was dismissed vide order dated 01.05.2018 (Annexure P-5); subsequently, respondents No. 6 to 10, 11 & 13 preferred a further revision petition (ROR No.507 of 2017-18), which was allowed vide order dated 11.01.2024 (Annexure P-6) on the ground that the lower Revenue Officer did not have the jurisdiction of any appeal or revision.

3. It transpires that the petitioner along with other similarly situated persons also filed a revision petition (ROR No.19 of 2023-24), challenging the *Sanad Takseem* dated 17.01.2013 (Annexure P-2), however, the same has been dismissed vide order dated 01.04.2025 (Annexure P-7).

4. In view of the aforementioned circumstances, present petition has been filed before this Court, for seeking relief(s) as noted hereinabove.

5. Heard.

6. During the course of hearing, a specific query was raised to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to what prejudice had been caused to the petitioner by the manner in which the partition in question has been carried out. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, failed to respond to the said query and fairly conceded that no document, such as a site plan or any other relevant material, had been placed on record to demonstrate any prejudice to

**CWP-32987-2025 (O&M)**

-3-

the petitioner, nor any such document was produced during the course of proceedings.

7. Since, learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to putforth any prejudice caused to the petitioner by the manner in which the partition has been carried out, I find no compelling reason, which may warrant interference by this Court, in the impugned partition proceedings/*Sanad Takseem*.

8. Resultantly the instant petition fails and same is accordingly dismissed.

9. All the pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

20.02.2026
ankit

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No