

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

224

**Civil Writ Petition No.6517 of 2016
Date of Decision: 24th August, 2016**

Raj Kumar Singal

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Sourabh Goel, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shubhra Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh Brar, Advocate
for respondents No.2 & 3.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

1. Through the instant writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the orders dated 11.02.2013 and 19.12.2014 (Annexures P-14 & P-18) vide which a demand for extension fee to the tune of ₹ 21,54,058/- was raised by respondent No.3-Estate Officer, HUDA, Panipat and representation dated 03.12.2014 (Annexure P-17) filed by the petitioner against the impugned demand order dated 11.02.2013 (Annexure P-14) was declined respectively. Further prayer has also been made to direct the respondents to refund the extension fees along with interest paid by the petitioner vide letter dated 12.02.2013 (Annexure P-16) in pursuance of the impugned demand order dated 11.02.2013 (Annexure P-14).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that various representations dated 29.07.2013/20.09.2013/21.10.2013/02.12.2013/09.12.2013/03.12.2014 (Annexure P-17) (colly.) have been filed by the petitioner whereas the respondent vide order dated 19.12.2014 (Annexure P-18) had rejected the claim made by the petitioner collectively without giving any reasons and by passing a non-speaking order. It was prayed by learned counsel for the petitioner that the writ petition be disposed of by giving a direction to respondent No.3 to pass a speaking order on the representations (Annexure P-17) collectively filed by the petitioner in a time bound manner and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner in accordance with law.

3. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, perusing the present petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to pass a speaking order on the representations (Annexure P-17) collectively filed by the petitioner after affording an opportunity of hearing to him within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

August 24, 2016
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No