



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

231

LPA-2716-2024 (O&M)
Decided on : 23.03.2026

GURLAL SINGH AND ANOTHER

...Appellant

Versus

SUPERINTENDING CANAL OFFICER AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

PRESENT: Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Yatin Bunker, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. H. K. Aurora, Advocate for the respondents No. 4 & 5.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 20.03.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby the writ petition No. 3726 of 2024 filed by the appellants challenging the order dated 28.06.2023 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Divisional Canal officer concerned for restoration of the water-course, EF, has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that relief has been granted to the private respondents by recording a finding that, as per the *warabandi* record, the watercourse which was demolished, was found to be in existence at the site in question and therefore, the order directing restoration of the watercourse is valid. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the said finding is otherwise, and therefore incorrect and the same was wrongly recorded.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and have gone through the case file with his able assistance.

**LPA-2716-2024 (O&M)**

4. It may be noticed that once the authorities concerned, as well as the learned Single Judge of this Court, on the basis of the actual facts on record, have recorded a finding that the application filed by respondents No. 4 and 5 for restoration of the watercourse in question was valid and that, as per the *warabandi* record, the watercourse existed at the site in question, disputing the said finding by way of filing the present appeal, cannot be entertained.

5. Further, nothing has been shown to this Court that the findings recorded by the authorities concerned, which have been upheld by the learned Single Judge while passing the order dated 20.03.2024 are contrary to the facts of the present case, the settled principles of law or the record itself.

6. Hence, in the present case, no perversity has been shown to this Court in the order passed by the authorities concerned as well as learned Single Judge, that the same is contrary to the facts of the present case or the settled principles of law.

7. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

8. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

23.03.2026

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/~~No~~

Whether Reportable: ~~Yes~~/No