

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision : 08.09.2017
CWP No.20316 of 2017

Bhim Sain

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

2.

CWP No.20320 of 2017

Mahender Pal @ Mahender Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

3.

CWP No.20324 of 2017

Amar Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

4.

CWP No.20325 of 2017

Murari Lal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

5.

CWP No.20357 of 2017

Sunil Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present : Mr. K. Arun Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana for respondent No.1.
Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 5.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Notice of motion.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana and Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate, present in Court, accept notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and respondents No.2 to 5, respectively. Copies of the writ petitions furnished.

For, the nature of order, I propose to pass in the matter, no formal written statements/counter affidavits are indeed necessary on behalf of the respondents, at this stage. Thus, with the consent of parties, these petitions are being disposed of finally.

A writ in the nature of mandamus is prayed for; directing the respondents to issue an 'instrument of Annuity' to the petitioners in terms of the R.R. Policy dated 07.12.2007 (Annexure P-1). Concededly, land holdings of the petitioners were acquired by the respondents for development and utilization of land as residential and commercial Sectors 9, 10, 11 & 11-A, Fatehabad. In terms of the policy dated 07.12.2007 (Annexure P-1), the claimants/landowners are entitled to annuity. The grievance of the petitioners is that respondents have failed to credit annuity for the year 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 in their respective accounts. So much so, the repeated visits as also the representations served upon the respondents have failed to evoke any response. And no result is insight

either. Rather, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are entitled to be awarded suitable interest for the delay that has occurred in disbursing the amount.

In response, learned counsel for the respondents submit that the claim of the petitioners as also their representations dated 25.06.2017 (Annexure P-3) shall be considered and decided within four weeks from today and the appropriate orders shall be passed in this regard.

That being so, the petitions are disposed of, in terms of the statement made by learned counsel for the respondents. However, the petitioners shall be at liberty to represent the respondents as regards interest on delayed payment of their claims. And, in the event, any such representations are made the same shall be considered and decided by the respondents in accordance with law.

08.09.2017

Manoj Bhutani

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No