

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

**C.O.C.P. No.1886 of 2015
Date of Decision: 13.02.2017**

Mohan Lal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Mr. P.C.Meena, Administrator, HUDA,
Sector 12, Faridabad and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Ashok Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Additional Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondents.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The petitioner claims that the *status quo* order, passed by this Court on 15.05.2015 in the pending CWP No.9679 of 2015 filed by the petitioner, has been violated by the respondents inasmuch as after undertaking some cleaning drive, a park has been created.

It is claimed that the interim order dated 15.05.2015 (**Annexure P-1**) was handed over in the Office of the Haryana Urban Development Authority (HUDA) on 03.06.2015 and the construction has been undertaken after the said date. The interim order dated 15.05.2015 reads as under:-

“ *Counsel for the petitioner relies upon letter dated 17.02.2014 (Annexure P-4) to contend that the petitioner's land is not included in any planning for the construction of the roads etc. Notice of motion 28.07.2015. Status quo regarding possession and further constructions etc. shall be maintained.* ”

Upon notice, HUDA Authorities have filed a reply asserting that the land in dispute is a part of Sector 37, Faridabad and the possession of the area stood handed over to the Municipal Corporation, Faridabad, who concededly is not a party in the pending writ petition. It is next submitted

that the aforesaid interim order was forwarded to the Office of Municipal Corporation, Faridabad on 23.07.2015.

The Authorities of the Municipal Corporation have filed their separate reply stating that from the moment the interim order came to their knowledge, no construction activity has been undertaken, apart from the objection that they have not been impleaded as a party in the main writ petition, which stands adjourned '*sine die*'. The Authorities of the Corporation have further undertaken not to undertake any further construction whatsoever.

After hearing learned Counsel for the parties and in view of the aforesaid circumstances, no further action is warranted.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

February 13, 2017
Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>