

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.16195 of 2017
Date of Decision : 31.08.2017

Tek Chand Aggarwal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present : Mr. V.B.Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana
for respondents No.1 to 7.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

This is a petition under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to pay the compensation along with interest to the petitioner in lieu of acquisition of his land.

Notice of motion.

Mr.Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana, present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 7.

For, the nature of the order I propose to pass in the matter no formal written statement is necessary on behalf of the respondents, at this stage.

It is urged that the land of the petitioner comprised in khasra No.2248/2 was acquired by the respondents vide an award No.7 dated 23.06.2010, rendered by the Land Acquisition Collector for Sectors 18, 18-A, Rohtak. In reference to the communication, dated 20.01.2017

(Annexure P-6), he submits that the petitioner was conveyed by respondent No.6 that the compensation qua the land comprised in khasra No.2248 has since been sent, vide cheque No.609301 dated 04.07.2011, to the reference Court, in a case under Section 30 of the Act titled as “Sheela Devi Vs. State of Haryana and others”. Whereas, he submits that the endorsement at page 27 of the paper book (Annexure P-7) shows that the records of the case of the petitioner were sent back by the reference Court to the Land Acquisition Officer, HUDA on 20.04.2017. But to date the petitioner has not been released the compensation he is entitled to. So much so, his representation dated 02.06.2017 (Annexure P-8) to the respondents has failed to evoke any response and no result is insight either.

In response, learned State counsel submits that the representation of the petitioner dated 02.06.2017 (Annexure P-8) shall be considered and decided by the authorities within a period of six weeks from today, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

That being so, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that let this petition be disposed of in the wake of the statement made by learned State counsel.

Ordered accordingly.

Needless to assert that a comprehensive order shall be passed assigning reasons in support thereof.

31.08.2017

Manoj Bhutani

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No