



121 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-35205-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.02.2026

Nachhatar Singh (Deceased) Through LRs

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Amandeep Singh Manaise, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rai Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for respondents No.5 to 9.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 30.07.2025 whereby Financial Commissioner has dismissed his revision against order dated 17.08.2023 passed by Commissioner.

2. As per pleadings, case of petitioner is that petitioner is owner of land which became subject matter of dispute before Sub-Judge, First Class, Fazilka in *Suit No.74 of 1959*. The suit was decreed vide order dated 02.01.1960 on the basis of compromise deed executed between the parties. As per compromise deed read with decree dated 02.01.1960, the respondents herein were supposed to pay a sum of Rs.50,800/- to petitioner herein by 13.03.1960. The amount had to be deposited in Court.

3. The petitioner claims that respondents herein did not deposit aforesaid amount as per consent decree resultantly land reverted to him. The respondents, on multiple occasions, requested Revenue Authorities to record mutation in their favour, however, the Competent Authority rejected their request. The respondents moved application dated 04.08.2021 before Revenue Authorities and Assistant Collector Grade 1 sanctioned mutation dated 18.10.2021 in favour of respondents. The petitioner preferred appeal which came to be allowed vide order dated 18.04.2022 passed by Collector. The respondents preferred appeal before Commissioner who vide order dated 17.08.2023 set aside order of the Collector and remanded the matter back to the Collector. The petitioner preferred revision which came to be dismissed vide order dated 30.07.2025 passed by the Financial Commissioner.

4. Learned counsel for the private respondents who have filed caveat submits that Financial Commissioner has not recorded findings on merit and order of Commissioner has been upheld. The matter has been remanded to Collector. It is now Collector who would decide the question whether respondents complied with decree dated 02.01.1960 or not.

5. The petitioner, at the first instance, was of the opinion that Financial Commissioner has not only upheld order of Commissioner but also recorded findings against him, however, in view of statement of learned counsel for the respondents, submits that he has no objection if Collector passes fresh order after granting opportunity of hearing to both sides.

6. In the wake of statements of both sides, the petition stands ***disposed of*** with a direction to petitioner as well as private respondents

and their LR's to appear before Collector on 05.03.2026 and thereafter as directed by said Officer.

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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

05.02.2026
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No