

Learned counsel for the petitioners, at the very outset, submits that he does not intend to press this writ petition for a writ in the nature of Certiorari, for the time being. He submits that in compliance of the order dated 27.10.2016 passed by this Court in CWP No. 22511 of 2016 (Charanjit Kaur and others Vs. State of Punjab and others), petitioners filed their revision petition, alongwith stay application, before the competent authority under Section 201 of the Punjab Panchayati Raj Act, 1994, on 1.11.2016. The case was listed for hearing before the competent authority on 2.11.2016 but no hearing could take place, because the Presiding Officer was not holding court. Learned counsel for the petitioners refers to the averments taken at page 23 of the paper book, to contend that since the concerned officer is holding charge of three departments, he hardly gets enough time to hear this type of cases. He

Civil Writ Petition No. 23194 of 2016

Amit Kumar
2016.11.10 10:18
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

also submits that in case, revision petition, alongwith stay application, filed by the petitioners is not heard and an appropriate interim order is not passed, petitioners will suffer serious prejudice and the very purpose of filing revision petition will be defeated.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioners and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the rights of either of the parties, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the Secretary, Department of Rural Development and Panchayat, Punjab-respondent No.1 to look into the matter, appreciate urgency of the issue involved and decide the revision petition filed by the petitioners, at an early date, by passing an appropriate order thereon, strictly in accordance with law, but in any case within the period already stipulated by this Court vide its order dated 27.10.2016.

However, keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, noticed hereinabove and also to ensure that revision filed by the petitioners may not render infructuous, operation of the impugned order dated 19.10.2016 (Annexure P-1), passed by the District Development and Panchayat Officer-respondent No.3, appointing Administrator of the village of the petitioners, shall remain stayed till the stay matter is heard and decided by respondent No.1.

With the abovesaid observations made and directions issued, present writ petition stands disposed of.

9.11.2016
Ak Sharma

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No