

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

**CM-12698-99-CWP-2015 and
CM-838-39-CWP-2014 and
RA-56-CWP-2014 in
CWP-4753-2013**

Sukhwinder Singh Gill & Ors.

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors.

Date of Decision: 16.10.2015

**CORAM: HONBLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HONBLE MR.JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA**

Present: Mr. SK Verma, Advocate for the applicants

SURYA KANT J. (Oral)

(1) The writ petition of the review-applicants along with other connected cases, challenging the acquisition of their lands were disposed of vide a common order dated 18.07.2013. One of the directions issued was that the petitioners shall be rehabilitated in accordance with the State Government policy dated 09.11.2010.

(2) The petitioners challenged the above-stated order before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and one of the pleas taken by them was that some of the writ petitions in which the same land acquisition was under challenge, are still pending in this Court. The Supreme Court permitted the petitioners to withdraw their SLP so as to file the instant review application.

(3) In the light of the above-mentioned plea, we directed on 25.07.2014 to list the pending cases including CWP No.8055 of 2009 and other connected cases.

(4) The review-applicants have filed another application (CM-12698-99-CWP-2015) seeking early hearing of their review application

on the ground that CWP-8055-2009 has since been decided by a coordinate Bench on July 3, 2015 on the same analogy as was applied by us while deciding the main case of review-applicants, namely, that they are entitled to the benefits admissible under the rehabilitation policy dated 09.11.2010.

(5) Heard learned counsel for the review-applicants. Since the very basis on which the review application was filed has disappeared, the only appropriate recourse for the review applicants is to seek the implementation of directions already issued in their favour. However, if there is any impediment against granting the benefits of policy decision dated 09.11.2010 or if the authorities have shown any reluctance in giving effect to those directions, there shall be liberty to the review applicants to raise such issues before an appropriate forum including the writ Court, if so advised.

(6) The review application as well as other miscellaneous applications stand disposed of accordingly.

(Surya Kant)
Judge

16.10.2015
vishal shonkar

(Surinder Gupta)
Judge