

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-23520-2016

Date of decision: 15.11.2016

Vijay Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

The Chief Administrator and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN**

PRESENT: Mr. MK Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia* seeking a writ in the nature of *Certiorari*, for setting aside the impugned order dated 29.04.2015 (Annexure P-2) passed by respondent No. 1 approving the proposal to levy compounding/regularization fee @ 15% of the last highest bid of the plot of the same size from the allottees of Market Committee, Uchana and Kosli and order dated 23.08.2016 (Annexure P-3) passed by respondent No. 3 levying a compounding fee of ₹ 8.28 lacs on account of construction of shop on the plot as per plan not approved by the Haryana State Agriculture Marketing Board.

2. It is pointed out that vide order dated 23.08.2016

(Annexure P-3), a sum of ₹ 8.28 lacs as compounding fee has been demanded from the petitioner.

3. After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the instant petition may be disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to file a detailed and comprehensive representation before respondent No. 1 raising all the pleas as have been raised herein. Further a prayer has been made that a direction be issued to respondent No. 1 to decide the representation in a time bound manner.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, perusing the present petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we dispose of the present petition by granting liberty to the petitioner to file a detailed and comprehensive representation raising all the pleas as raised in the present writ petition before respondent No. 1 within a period of one month from today. It is directed that in the event of filing such representation by the petitioner within the stipulated period, the same shall be decided by respondent No. 1 within next two months, in accordance with law by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

November 15, 2016
rishu

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No