

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.14764 of 2015 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 10.03.2016

Ravinder Kumar

....Petitioner

versus

Haryana Urban Development Authority and others

.....Respondents

2. Civil Writ Petition No.14844 of 2015 (O&M)

Kartar Singh

....Petitioner

versus

Haryana Urban Development Authority and others

.....Respondents

3. Civil Writ Petition No.14835 of 2015 (O&M)

Ram Bilas

....Petitioner

versus

Haryana Urban Development Authority and others

.....Respondents

4. Civil Writ Petition No.26394 of 2015 (O&M)

Usha Rani

....Petitioner

versus

Haryana Urban Development Authority and others

.....Respondents

5. Civil Writ Petition No.26338 of 2015 (O&M)

Usha Rani

....Petitioner

versus

Haryana Urban Development Authority and others

.....Respondents

6. Civil Writ Petition No.26397 of 2015 (O&M)

Vipin Kumar

....Petitioner

versus

Haryana Urban Development Authority and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.J. VAZIFDAR, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI**

Present: Mr. Umesh Narang, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate for HUDA in
CWP Nos.14764, 14844 and 14835 of 2015

Mr. Deepak Sabharwal, Advocate for HUDA in
CWP Nos.26338, 26394 and 26397 of 2015

..

S.J. VAZIFDAR, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral):

These six petitions involve identical facts and, hence,
are being disposed of by this common order.

2. The petitioners have challenged the order passed by the
Estate Officer upholding the demand of extension fee.

3. The petitioners contend that the extension fee cannot be
charged as possession was never handed over. The respondents, on
the other hand, seek to file an affidavit contending that the
possession was never taken by the petitioners. This is one of the
main questions of fact that arises in each of these matters.

4. The petitioners have an alternate remedy of appeal
against the impugned order of the Estate Officer. In the facts and
circumstances of these cases especially in view of the disputed

questions of fact, the petitioners must avail the alternate remedy in the first instance.

5. The petitions are accordingly disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to pursue the alternate remedy.

(S.J. VAZIFDAR)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

10.03.2016
parkash*

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE