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

<u>CWP-32087-2025 (O&M)</u> Date of decision :31.10.2025

NARESH KUMAR AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Navmohit Singh, Advocate

and Mr. Najar Singh, Advocate

for the petitioners.

Mr. Abhimanyu Antil, D.A.G., Haryana.

## HARSH BUNGER, J. [ORAL]

Prayer in the present writ petition, filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, for quashing the *sanad takseem* dated 24.12.2024 (Annexure P-5) passed in the partition proceedings of agricultural land comprised in *khewat No.48, khata Nos.63 and 65*, situated in Village Machhraula, Hadbast No.21, Tehsil and District Sonipat.

- 2. Briefly, respondent No.3 filed an application seeking partition of joint land, comprised in *khewat No.48/46*, measuring *41 kanal 11 marlas* situated at Village Machhraula, Tehsil and District Sonipat (as per jamabandi for the year 2021-22).
- 2.1 In the afore-said partition proceedings, naksha 'ka' was prepared according to which, the petitioners' entitlement to land was stated

as 2 kanal–11 marlas each. Thereafter, mode of partition (Annexure P-3) was prepared and on that basis, the partition proceedings were carried out by preparing and approving naksha 'kha' followed by naksha 'ga' and the partition proceedings culminated into with the drawing of sanad takseem dated 24.12.2024 (Annexure P-5).

- 2.2 In the afore-mentioned circumstances, the present writ petition has been filed before this Court, for seeking relief as noticed here-in-above.
- 3. Heard.
- 4. At the outset, it is noticeable that although, *sanad takseem* (Annexure P-5) can be challenged before the learned Commissioner under Section 16 of the Haryana Land Revenue Act; however, petitioners have chosen to file the writ petition directly before this Court.
- 5. Learned counsel for the petitioners has raised two fold arguments; *firstly* that while carrying out the final partition, the possession of the petitioners over *khasra No.4//19* and *20* has been disturbed, which is contrary to Clause 6 of the mode of partition (Annexure P-3). *Secondly*, the petitioners have been allotted land, which is in possession of *gair marusi*.
- As regards the first contention, a specific query was put to learned counsel for the petitioners as to whether the petitioners had raised any objection to the proposed *naksha 'kha'*; to which, the answer of the learned counsel for the petitioners was in 'negative'. Therefore, once the petitioners had failed to raise any objection at the relevant stage of partition proceedings, when *naksha 'kha'* was proposed (which indicated the manner in which the land was to be divided amongst the co-sharers), now at this stage, when *naksha 'kha'* (as proposed) has been approved and on that basis, *naksha 'Ga'* was finalized and *sanad takseem* stands issued; the petitioners cannot be permitted to turn around and re-open the entire

partition proceedings by objecting to the manner in which the land has been allocated amongst the co-sharers. Accordingly, the first contention of the petitioners stands rejected.

- 5.2 Coming to the second contention that the petitioners have been allotted land, which is in possession of *gair marusi*; suffice it to say that upon final partition, a *gair marusi* (tenant) under particular co-owner will be entitled to occupy only that area, which is allocated to his landlord. If the so-called *gair marusi* (tenant) was not inducted by the petitioners then they shall not be entitled to the possession of the land, which has been allocated to the petitioners under the *sanad takseem*.
- 6. No other point has been urged.
- 7. Keeping in view the above, I find no merit in this petition and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.
- 8. All pending applications (if any) shall also stand closed.

October 31, 2025 gurpreet

(HARSH BUNGER) JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Whether reportable:

Yes/No Yes/No