

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.17779 of 2014

Date of Decision:- 29.10.2015.

Municipal Committee, Ganaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

The Commissioner, Rohtak Division and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

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?

Present: Mr. Ashwani Gaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Kirti Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajbir Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SURYA KANT, J. (ORAL)

1.) Learned counsel for respondent No.2, on instructions, fairly states that the said respondent has no objection if the Commissioner, Rohtak Division exercising the powers of Director Consolidation is directed to decide the matter afresh after taking notice of the rival submissions of both the parties and in accordance with law.

2.) In this view of the matter and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the impugned order dated

15.3.2013 is set aside and respondent No.1 is directed to decide the petition-cum-application filed by respondent No.2, in accordance with law after hearing the parties. It shall be appreciated if the appropriate order is passed within four months. Till then both the parties are directed to maintain status quo re : possession and title.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

October 29, 2015.

sandeep sethi