

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.20635 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 21.03.2017

Satyendra Singh & Ors.

... Petitioners

VS.

State of Haryana & Ors.

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr. Amar Vivek, Addl. AG Haryana (for HUDA as well)

Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate for the applicant

SURYA KANT, J. (Oral)

(1) Learned Addl. AG Haryana who also represents HUDA, states that no land of petitioners No.1 to 3 who are sons of Hari Singh has been acquired. The writ petition *qua* them is thus infructuous. Ordered accordingly.

(2) As regard to petitioner No.4 (Lalit Rajput s/o Nanak Chand), learned Addl. AG Haryana states at the bar that he will be given suitable package under the Special Package Scheme along with other similarly-placed oustees of NPR.

(3) In view of the fair stand taken on behalf of the respondents, writ petition *qua* petitioner No.4 is also disposed of in view of the above undertaking. Let the needful be done within a period of two months.

(4) Though we are sure that the grievance of petitioner No.4 would be fully redressed, however with an abundant precaution, liberty is granted to him to re-agitate the matter before an appropriate forum, if still dissatisfied. Still further, if petitioner No.4 does not want any special package, he may challenge the acquisition proceedings *qua* him.

CM-1349-CWP-2017

Since the main writ petition has been disposed of, the application has become infructuous and is disposed of accordingly.

CM-16163-64-CWP-2016

In view of the fact that the writ petition has been disposed of, no specific order is required to be passed in these applications.

**(Surya Kant)
Judge**

21.03.2017
vishal shonkar

**(Sudip Ahluwalia)
Judge**

- 1. Whether speaking/reasoned?*
- 2. Whether reportable?*

Yes
No