

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

CWP No.26365 of 2017
Date of decision: 21.11.2017

Raj Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Notice of motion.

Ms. Safia Gupta, AAG, Haryana, present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Copies furnished.

For the nature of order I propose to pass in the matter, no formal written statement(s)/counter affidavit(s) on behalf of the respondents is indeed necessary, at this stage. Thus, with the consent of the parties, the petition is being finally disposed of.

This is a petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, praying for a writ of mandamus, directing the respondents to issue an instrument of annuity to the petitioner on account of the acquisition of his land, in accordance with the RR Policies, dated 07.12.2007 & 09.11.2010 (Annexures P1 & P2) and other benefits. Concededly, the land of the petitioner was acquired for development and utilization of land as residential and commercial Sectors 4, 5, 7 and Sectors 9, 10, 11 & 11-A, Fatehabad.

Although, the petitioner has been disbursed the compensation in terms of the

award rendered by the Collector as also the enhancement made by the Reference Court and by this Court, however, the limited grievance that he has is that the respondents have failed to credit the amount of annuity for the year 2016-17 in his account. And even the representation dated 26.07.2017 (Annexure P3) that he had made to the respondents had failed to evoke any response.

In response, learned State counsel submits that the claim of the petitioner as also his representation/legal notice dated 26.07.2017 (Annexure P3) which the respondents are alleged to have been served, shall be considered and decided within a period of six weeks from today. And the appropriate orders, in accordance with law, shall be passed.

Accordingly, the petition is disposed of in the above terms. Needless to assert that in the event the petitioner is not found entitled to the relief being claimed, the competent authority shall pass a comprehensive order assigning reasons in support thereof.

November 21, 2017
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES
NO