

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-25468-2017

Date of Decision: November 09, 2017

Ravinder Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | To be referred to the Reporters or not? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? | Yes/No. |
| 3. | Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? | Yes/No |

.....

Present: Mr.Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate for the petitioner.

.....

SURYA KANT, J.

The petitioner's grievance in the instant writ petition is that the directions issued by this Court in CWP No.11942-2012 decided on 08.05.2013, titled **Pepsico India Holding Private Limited, Company vs Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Panipat and others,** (Annexure P-4) are not being complied with whereby the appeal filed by respondent No.5 was directed to be decided in a time-bound manner. It is urged that respondent No.5 is enjoying the stay order to retain possession over the Gram Panchayat land and there is thus collusion behind non-adjudication of the said appeal.

[2] We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner. In our considered view, the petitioner will be well within his right to initiate appropriate proceedings for wilful disobedience of the directions contained in the order dated 08.05.2013, for non-compliance of those directions gives a

continuous cause of action to every resident of the village.

[3] With the liberty aforestated, the writ petition is disposed of.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

November 09, 2017
meenuss

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/reasoned ? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable ? | Yes/No |