

205

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

CWP No.12670 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 14.03.2016

RAJ BALA AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Vs

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

....Respondents

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

Present:Mr. M.L. Sarin, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Hemant Sarin, Advocate
Mr. N.C. Kinra, Advocate and
Mr. Harsh Kinra, Advocate
for the petitioners.
Mr. Sunil K. Sahore, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Ms. Palika Monga, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate
for respondent-M.C. Rohtak.

Mr. Kunal Muthreja, Advocate and
Ms. Rinku Dahiya, Advocate for
Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate
for respondent No.6 in CWP No.15509 of 2012.

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

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.(Oral)

[1]. By this common order CWP Nos.12670, 12671, 14893, 14923 and 15509 of 2012 are being disposed of as according to the learned counsel for the parties the issue involved herein is

identical in these writ petitions. For brevity, the facts are being taken from CWP No.12670 of 2012.

[2]. The challenge in this writ petition is to the acquisition proceedings initiated vide notification dated 11.11.2010 (Annexure P-4) which was followed by notification dated 09.11.2011 (Annexure P-12) and all the subsequent proceedings taken thereto.

[3]. Learned State counsel has produced a communication received from the office of Directorate of Urban Estates, Haryana addressed to Advocate General, Haryana vide memo no.201 dated 11.01.2016 intimating the proposal regarding dropping of the acquisition proceedings on land measuring 24.3875 acres under both the notifications issued under Sections 4 & 6 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short 'the Act') for widening of road as well as for green belt. The aforesaid proposal has been approved by the Government and further action is being taken to de-notify the land acquired under the said notifications. It is further stated that High Court be apprised accordingly. The said communication is taken on record.

[4]. In view of above, these writ petitions are disposed of as infructuous. The respondents shall remain bound by the communication dated 11.01.2016. It is, however, clarified that in case the land is not denotified under the Act as stated in the

aforesaid communication, it shall be open to the petitioner(s) to
file application(s) for revival of these petitions.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

14.03.2016
Atik

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE