

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.25437 of 2012
Date of Decision: December 03, 2015

Bhagat Singh and sonsPetitioner

versus

The State of Punjab and othersRespondents

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

Present: Mr.Karn Singh Cheema, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr.Rajesh Bhardwaj, Additional AG, Punjab.
Mr.Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.4

:-

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?

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has laid challenge to the order-cum-demand notice dated 14.09.2012 (P-4), purportedly passed in deference to the decision dated 13.07.2012 rendered by this Court in an earlier writ petition of the petitioner, i.e., CWP No.21674 of 2010.

Though it is pointed-out by learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation that the facts of this case are different than those of CWP No.17624 of 2013 (Khalsa Pulp and Paper Industries Pvt. Ltd. vs. The State of Punjab and others) decided by way of a separate order of even date and the instant case need not be remitted on the analogy of the cited case but we are of the considered view that let the respondent-Corporation take a holistic view in this case as well which is from the very beginning tagged with the main case of M/s

Khalsa Pulp and Paper Industries (supra) decided today.

We thus without expressing any views on merits, allow this writ petition and quash the impugned order dated 14.09.2012 (P-4) with a direction that let the petitioner's liability towards payment of balance allotment price of the plot in question be re-determined in accordance with law. It shall be appreciated if the representative of petitioner is accorded opportunity of personal hearing before re-determination of its claim.

Ordered accordingly.

Dasti.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

December 03, 2015
mohinder

[P.B.BAJANTHRI]
JUDGE