

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

**CWP No.11493 of 2017
Date of decision:31.05.2017**

Gram Panchayat Mandi, Block Ismailabad,
Kurukshetra

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

The grievance of the petitioner is that there is no notification of bifurcation of the petitioner – Gram Panchayat and the private respondent- Gram Panchayat, who was the petitioner in the petition filed under Section 215-A of the Haryana Panchayati Raj Act 1994 read with Rule 31-A before the Collector. The Collector, vide interim order dated 09.05.2017 (Annexure P-2), restrained the petitioner-panchayat from spending 50% amount of its income from the sources and directed to deposit 50% amount in the account of BDPO Ismailabad.

I am of the view that once the matter is seized before the aforementioned authority, though according to Mr. Vikram Singh, there is no bifurcation, therefore, the petition would not be maintainable. The petitioner is at liberty to take up all the pleas which have been raised in this writ petition and place on record any other documents or further plea for

seeking vacation of the interim order, much less maintainability of the petition. In case, such application is moved, the Collector, Kurukshetra shall decide the same within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Resultantly, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 31, 2017
savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No