

COCP No.2400 of 2016

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

**COCP No.2400 of 2016
Date of Order: 22.3.2017**

Uttranchal Yuva Patrakar Co-op. House Building Society Ltd

....Petitioner

Versus

P. Raghavendra Rao IAS and Ors.

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Raman Gaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Indresh Goyal, Addl.AG, Haryana.

JASWANT SINGH, J (ORAL)

By preferring the instant contempt petition under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, a grievance has been made by the petitioner-Society, whose land situated in Village Chowki, Tehsil and District Panchkula was proposed to be acquired under the provisions of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 for the development and utilization of land for recreational and public and semi public Sector 32 Area that the order dated 18.5.2015 passed by this Court in Civil Writ petition No.9013 of 2014 has not been complied with, the relevant part of which reads as under:

“ After hearing learned counsel for the parties, 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 the appropriate

authority. It is directed that in the event of a representation being filed by the petitioner within a period of two months from today, the same shall be decided in accordance with law by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner within a period of four months from the date of receipt of representation. The petitioner shall be entitled to lead any evidence to substantiate its claim before the concerned authority. It is, however, made clear that in case no such representation is filed within the stipulated period as noticed above, the interim order shall cease to operate, thereafter. ”

Upon notice, reply by way of affidavit dated 29.11.2016 of Vikas Gupta, Director, Urban Estates Department, Haryana and Chief Administrator, HUDA has been filed on behalf of respondent Nos.1 & 2 alleging that in compliance of the order, the grouse of the petitioner has been vindicated by passing a speaking order dated 24.11.2016 **(R.1)** passed by the Administrator, HUDA-cum-Additional Director, Urban Estates, Haryana.

Faced with the the situation, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the petition with liberty to challenge the speaking order **(R.1)**.

Allowed as prayed for.

March 22, 2017
manoj

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No