

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

**CM No. 2723-CWP of 2016 in/and
CWP No. 13129 of 2006
Decided on : 14.03.2016**

Dr. Anil Bansal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH**

PRESENT: Mr. Tushar Sharma, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Arun Walia, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Ajay Nara, Advocate
for respondents No.2 & 4 – HUDA.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

CM No. 2723-CWP of 2016

This is an application filed under Section 151 of the CPC, seeking withdrawal of the writ petition with liberty to avail the alternative remedy of revision as provided under the provisions of the Haryana Urban Development Authority Act, 1977 (in short 'Act of 1977').

Notice of this application.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana and Mr. Ajay Nara, Advocate, accept notice on behalf of the non-applicant/respondents and plead no objection to the withdrawal of the writ petition.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the contents of the application, which is supported by an affidavit of the applicant-petitioner, the Civil Miscellaneous Application is hereby allowed and the applicant-petitioner is permitted to withdraw the writ petition.

CWP No. 13129 of 2006

At the joint request of learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is taken up for hearing today.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that while admitting the writ petition on 26th September, 2006, this Court had passed an interim order, whereby, it was directed that the plot in question shall not be allotted by the respondents to anybody till further orders. It was urged that the aforesaid interim order is still in force. A prayer was made that this interim protection be continued for one month for the petitioner to avail the alternative remedy of revision as provided under the provisions of Act of 1977, in accordance with law.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents plead no objection to the continuation of the interim order dated 26th September, 2006.

4. In view the above and keeping in view the order of even date passed in CM No. 2723-CWP of 2016, the present writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn. It shall, however, be open to the petitioner to take recourse to the remedies as may be available to him, in accordance with law. However, the interim protection as granted by this Court vide order dated 26th September, 2006, shall continue for a period of one month from today. Needless to say, the continuation of the interim order shall not be taken to be any expression of opinion on the merits of the controversy involved in the present writ petition.

**(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE**

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

March 14, 2016

J.Ram