

KULDEEP SINGH VS STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.

...

It has been *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the mutation proceedings initiated by the petitioner were decided by the Collector vide order dated 28.12.2017. He submits that respondent No.4 challenged the same by way of filing of appeal, however, the appeal filed by respondent No.4 was dismissed as withdrawn. He submits that the learned Collector had already observed in his order dated 28.12.2017 that mutation No.1512 was attested on the basis of the mutation No.1518 which was already cancelled and thus, mutation No.1512 was not sustainable, however, thereafter vide order dated 31.08.2018, in an appeal filed by respondent No.4, a contrary view was taken and the impugned order was passed, which is totally against the evidence on record, thus, deserves to be set aside.

Notice of motion for 14.09.2023.

Process dasti as well.

Status quo be maintained till the next date of hearing.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

03.07.2023
sharmila