

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

**CWP No. 6719 of 2015
Decided on : 09.04.2015**

Harvinder Singh

. . . Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and another

. . . Respondents

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

PRESENT: Mr. Sanjiv Manrai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. S.S. Kamboj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of *Certiorari* for quashing the impugned order dated 21.11.2014/26.11.2014 (Annexure P-10), passed by respondent No.2 i.e. Land Acquisition Collector-cum-Sub Divisional Magistrate, Mohali, whereby, the land of the petitioner was ordered to be attached and the petitioner has been required to deposit back ₹ 54,40,500/-.

2. It was urged by learned counsel for the petitioner that after the announcement of the award, and payment having been made to the petitioner, the respondent No.2 could not have issued order Annexure P-10. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondent No.2 had illegally attached the property of the petitioner mentioned in Annexure P-9, and coercive steps are being taken for recovery of the amount.

3. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, perusing the

averments made in the writ petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we dispose of this writ petition by relegating the petitioner to file a detailed and comprehensive representation before respondent No.2, questioning the validity of Annexure P-10, on the basis of the factual averments made in the instant writ petition. Let a detailed and comprehensive representation be filed before respondent No.2 within a period of one month from today, who shall decide the same within a period of next three months, by passing a speaking order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, in accordance with law. It is also clarified that no coercive steps shall be taken in pursuance to Annexure P-10 during the time representation is decided by respondent No.2. Needless to say, in case no such representation is filed by the petitioner, respondent No.2 shall be at liberty to proceed in accordance with law.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

April 09, 2015
J.Ram