



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

**CWP-24858-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.10.2025**

Savita Kumari and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Upasana Dhawan, AAG, Haryana.

HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present writ petition, filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is, *inter alia*, seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *Certiorari* for setting aside the order dated 27.01.2023 (Annexure P-6) passed by the learned Assistant Collector, First Grade, Rohtak, whereby *Sanad Takseem* was issued; and order dated 28.05.2025 (Annexure P-8) passed by the learned Commissioner, Rohtak Division, Rohtak.

2. Briefly, respondent No.4 namely Jaipal filed an application seeking partition of joint land comprised in Khewat No.386//336, measuring 134 kanal 17 marlas, situated at Village Bhagwatipur, Tehsil and District

Rohtak.

2.1. In the aforesaid partition proceedings, the Mode of Partition (Annexure P-2) was prepared. As per the own pleaded case of the petitioners, no objection was raised to the Mode of Partition and accordingly, the same was approved and *Naksha 'Kha'* was called from the Field Staff.

2.2. Apparently, since no objections were filed to *Naksha 'Kha'*, the opportunity to file objections were closed vide order dated 28.09.2022 (Annexure P-4) and on that basis, *Naksha 'Gha'* was prepared and the partition proceedings were concluded with the drawing of *Sanad Takseem* vide order dated 27.01.2023 (Annexure P-6).

2.3. Feeling aggrieved against the partition proceedings/*Sanad Takseem*, the petitioners preferred a revision before the learned Commissioner, Rohtak Division, Rohtak, which has been dismissed vide the impugned order dated 28.05.2025 (Annexure P-8).

3. In the aforementioned circumstances, the present writ petition has been filed before this Court for seeking relief(s) as noticed hereinabove.

4. Heard.

5. During the course of hearing, a specific query was raised to the learned counsel for the petitioners as to whether any objection was filed by the petitioners to the proposed *Naksha 'Bey'*. In response thereto, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that no any objection was filed to the proposed *Naksha 'Bey'*.

6. Once when the petitioners had an opportunity to raise objection to the proposed *Naksha 'Bey'*, which indicated the allocation of land to the different co-sharers in the Khewat and any objection to the proposed *Naksha 'Bey'* having not been filed and the *Naksha 'Bey'* having been approved and on that basis, the *Naksha 'Zeem'* being finalized and the

partition proceedings were concluded with the drawing of *Sanad Takseem*, now after the final partition, the petitioners cannot be permitted to raise objections as regards the allocation of shares to the respective co-sharers by reopening the entire process.

7. In view of the above, I find no merit in the present writ petition, the same is accordingly, dismissed.

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

09.10.2025

Pd

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

2. Whether reportable : Yes/No