

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

**CWP No. 11072 of 2013
Decided on : 12.05.2015**

Krishan Murari

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL**

PRESENT: Mr. Ram Avtar Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CWP Nos. 11072 & 11179 of 2013).

Mr. Amit Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CWP No. 4485 of 2015).

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Kamal Sehgal, Advocate
for respondent No.3 – HSIIDC
(in CWP Nos. 11072 & 11179 of 2013).

Mr. Rajinder Mathur, Advocate
for respondent No.3 – HSIIDC (in CWP No. 4485 of 2015).

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of CWP Nos. 11072, 11179 of 2013 and 4485 of 2015, as the same notifications have been impugned by the petitioners. Relevant facts are being extracted from CWP No. 11072 of 2013.

2. The petitioners have approached this Court by way of present writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of *Certiorari*, for quashing the notification dated 16.03.2012 (Annexure P-11), issued under Section 4 of the Land acquisition Act, 1894 (for short 'the Act'), followed by notification dated 16.03.2013 (Annexure P-13), issued under Section 6 of the Act, qua the petitioners.

3. Learned State counsel has produced a communication dated 16.03.2015, addressed to the District Revenue Officer-cum-LAC, Gurgaon, Haryana issued by the Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd., wherein, it has been stated that the award was required to be announced by DRO-cum-LAC, Gurgaon on or before 03.04.2015 as per proclamation made vide Rapat Roznamcha Vakiyati of Patwari halqua dated 04.04.2013. It has been further stated that the Government of Haryana, Industries Department has decided not to acquire the said piece of land vide order dated 13.03.2015 on the relevant file. The communication dated 16.03.2015, is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

4. In view thereof, learned counsel for the petitioners state that the writ petitions have become infructuous and may be disposed of as such. However, a prayer was made to file an application for revival of the writ petitions in case something survives therein.

5. Accordingly, the present writ petition(s) are disposed of as infructuous with liberty as prayed for.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

May 12, 2015
J.Ram