



CWP-37500-2025

-1-

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

105

CWP-37500-2025

Date of Decision: 27.01.2026

Balbir Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Ms. Arzoo Modi, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to take action against respondent No.5 who had forged and fabricated revenue record with intent to give undue advantage to respondents Nos.6 to 8.

2. The petitioner purchased land measuring 1 Kanal 10 Marlas vide sale deed dated 29.12.2004 from Rajinder Singh. The mutation was sanctioned in his favour on 06.05.2005. Respondent No.5-Naib Tehsildar in connivance with private respondents manipulated revenue record by way of correction in the *Khasra Girdawari* without any application of private respondents. He was transferred and left charge on 25.05.2005 still on the same day issued notice to the parties, conducted spot inspection and passed order dated 25.05.2005 whereby *Khasra Girdawari* was changed in favour of private respondents. The petitioner filed Civil Suit. Reader to the Tehsildar admitted before the Court that no *Pattanama* in favour of

Respondent No.7 was available and he cannot produce record regarding



CWP-37500-2025

-2-

application for correction of *Khasra Girdawari*. The petitioner filed application before the authorities seeking action against respondent No.5. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Jalandhar conducted inquiry and found that issuing notice to the parties, conducting spot inspection and deciding case on the same day raises doubt. The petitioner has suffered for 14 years in different Courts. Despite report of the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Jalandhar no further action has been taken.

3. Learned State counsel submits that jurisdictional Deputy Commissioner would consider the matter in due course.

4. The respondent in the wake of report of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Jalandhar was supposed to process the matter. As per report, there were irregularities on the part of Naib Tehsildar. The authorities were bound to take an appropriate action in the wake of report of Sub-Divisional Magistrate. A reasonable period has already passed away, thus, this Court finds it appropriate to direct respondent No.4-Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar to look into the matter and take an appropriate action in accordance with law within three months from today.

5. The petition stands disposed of in above terms.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

27.01.2026

Mohit Kumar

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