



123

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

CWP-12554-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 24.04.2026

Ratan Singh @ Rattan Singh & Ors

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI**

Present : Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Mago, DAG Haryana for respondent Nos.1 to 3.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners as well as respondent Nos.1 to 3/State are *ad idem* that the land in dispute had vested in the Municipal Corporation in the year 2010, hence, the Collector would have no jurisdiction to try the suit under Section 13-A of the Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961, as applicable to the State of Haryana (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1961 Act').

2. There is no dispute that in view of the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Anar Singh Vs. Commissioner, Rohtak Division, Rohtak & Ors. [2014 (2) RCR (Civil) 258]**, once the municipal limits were extended, it would only be the Civil Court which would have the jurisdiction to decide the matter as the common land of a Gram Panchayat is no longer amenable or subject to the statutory control by the provisions of the 1961 Act. In view thereof, both the orders dated 23.07.2024



2026:PHHC:063049-DB

CWP-12554-2026 (O&M)

(Annexure P-7) passed by the Collector and 29.12.2025 (Annexure P-9) passed by the Commissioner are set aside. However, as held in the judgment in **Anar Singh's case** (supra), the petitioners would always have the liberty to avail their remedies as available in law.

3. Disposed off accordingly. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

24.04.2026
Yogesh Sharma

(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO