

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

248

CR No. 3483 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: November 15, 2016

SUNDEEP GUPTA AND ANR

-PETITIONERS

VS

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, GURGAON AND ANR

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Adarsh Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ramandeep, Advocate for
Mr. Satish Singla, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr. H.S. Grewal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the impugned notices challenged in the suit itself have been withdrawn by respondent No.1 and an application has been moved before the trial Court. Withdrawal of impugned notices would render the suit infructuous on the date fixed.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 is fully in concurrence with learned counsel for the petitioners in principle

that the withdrawal of impugned notices by the Municipal Corporation, Gurgaon would definitely entail in dismissal of the suit as infructuous. Respondent No.2 would in any case not oppose the application filed by the Municipal Corporation, Gurgaon withdrawing the impugned notices issued against the plaintiff-petitioners.

Both the parties are *ad idem* that follow up action would be taken on the date fixed before the trial Court.

In view of aforesaid statement, this revision petition has become infructuous.

Ordered accordingly.

Liberty is granted to get the revision petition revived in case the statement of fact made by learned counsel for respondent No.2 is found to be non-existent.

15.11.2016

jyoti Y.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No