

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

CWP No. 13189 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.03.2017.

Bhim Singh and others

..... Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.S. SARON
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DARSHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate, for the petitioners.

S.S. SARON, J.

The petition has been filed by the petitioners seeking a mandamus for directing the respondents; i.e. State of Haryana, Haryana Urban Development Authority, Panchkula and Municipal Corporation, Faridabad respectively to get the land belonging to the State of Haryana vacated from illegal possession of the encroachers against whom proceedings were being taken very slowly.

When the case came up for hearing on 13.07.2016, time was sought by learned counsel for the petitioners to show the contribution of the petitioners to the society so as to determine their *locus standi* to entitle them to file a public interest litigation; besides, particulars of the land which was stated to have been encroached upon and also to ascertain as to whether the land fell under the Haryana Urban Development Authority or the Municipal Corporation, Faridabad. It was also to be ascertained as to what was the stage and the nature of suit that was stated to have been filed by the encroachers of the land at District Courts, Faridabad. A mention in this

regard has been made in the communication (Annexure P4) addressed to Hon'ble the Chief Minister, Haryana.

The case was adjourned to 20.07.2016. On the said date, none appeared for the petitioners and it was adjourned to 14.09.2016. On the said date, more time was sought to comply with the order dated 13.07.2016 and the case was adjourned to 08.11.2016. An adjournment slip was filed on the said date and it was adjourned to 16.01.2017. On the last date, i.e. 16.01.2017, it was adjourned for today.

Today when the case was taken up, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that despite making efforts, the necessary information was not forthcoming. Therefore, he prays that he may be allowed to withdraw the present petition leaving it to the petitioners to seek their alternative remedies in the first instance.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

(S.S. SARON)
JUDGE

(DARSHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

07.03.2017
Ramesh

Note:

1.	Whether reasoned/speaking	:	Yes
2.	Whether reportable	:	No