

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 7950 of 2015
Date of decision : December 1, 2015

Rakesh Kumar
..... Petitioner
Versus
M/s Welspun Projects Limited and others
..... Respondents

CR No. 7967 of 2015

Sunil Kumar
..... Petitioner
Versus
M/s Welspun Projects Limited and others
..... Respondents

CR No. 7978 of 2015

Ajay Patel
..... Petitioner
Versus

Punjab State Bus Stand Management Company Ltd. and another

CR No. 8033 of 2015

Munish Arora and another
..... Petitioner
Versus

Punjab State Bus Stand Management Company Ltd. and others

CR No. 8044 of 2015

Ram Lubhaya
..... Petitioner
Versus

Punjab State Bus Stand Management Company Ltd. and others
..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Sudhir Paruthi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

This order of mine shall dispose of CR Nos. 7950, 7967, 7978,8033 and 8044 of 2015 as common question of law involves in all the revision petitions.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate, who is present in Court accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-Punjab State Bus Stand Management Co.Ltd.in all the civil revision petitions.

During the course of arguments, Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate has informed the Court that they shall not dis-possess the petitioner except in due course of law as proceedings under Punjab Public Premises and Land (Eviction and Rent) Recovery Act, 1973 have already been initiated, therefore, no cause of action survives in the present revision petitions.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the sole grievance of the petitioner is that they should not be dis-possessed except in due course of law as the Auction notice tantamounts to dispossession without availing the remedy in accordance with law.

Keeping in view the fact that the respondents had initiated proceedings under Punjab Public Premises and Land (Eviction and Rent) Recovery Act, 1973, till the proceedings initiated are decided by court competent to try and hear the petitions it is directed that the aforementioned petitioner shall not be dispossessed. In case the finding rendered by the competent court is against any of the parties to the *lis*, the parties shall be competent to challenge the same in accordance with law.

It is made clear that during the pendency of the proceedings before 1st competent authority appointed under the act the petitioner shall continue to pay the license fee as agreed.

Accordingly, all the revisions petitions stand disposed of.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

December 1, 2015
archana