

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.21182 of 2015 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 20.10.2015

(i) CWP No.21182 of 2015 (O&M)

Tulinder Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

(ii) CWP No.21183 of 2015 (O&M)

Bhau Varinder Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAJ RAHUL GARG**

Present: Shri M.L. Saggar, Senior Advocate, with  
Shri Sunny Saggar, Advocate, for the petitioners.

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

**Hemant Gupta, J.**

This order shall dispose of the above mentioned two writ petitions as they raise common questions of law and facts.

The challenge in the present writ petitions is to the publication of a final development plan vide notification dated 11.01.2013 under Section 5 of the Punjab Scheduled Roads and Controlled Areas Restriction of Unregulated Development Act, 1963 (for short 'the Act'). The petitioners have sought quashing of the said

notification in view of the fact that the draft notification published on 29.10.2007 has become redundant. The petitioners have asserted that as per the report of the Land Acquisition Collector dated 18.09.2009, the land which is subject matter of acquisition is a fertile land and therefore, the acquisition proceedings should be dropped. On 11.02.2010 (Annexure P.7), one of the land owners was intimated that the Government had taken a decision on 14.07.2009 to revise the development plan. In view of the said decision, the draft development plan published on 29.10.2007 is rendered redundant. Therefore, the final development plan published on 11.01.2013 is not sustainable.

Similar plea was raised in CWP No. 1026 of 2010 – Sugan Chand and another v. State of Haryana and others, which was taken up for hearing today. Vide separate orders of the even date, the aforesaid writ petition has been dismissed.

In view of the reasons recorded in Sugan Chand's case (supra), we do not find any merit in the present writ petitions. The same are accordingly dismissed.

**(Hemant Gupta)**  
**Judge**

**(Raj Rahul Garg)**  
**Judge**

20.10.2015  
ds