

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

Date of decision : 08.11.2017

213

1. CWP No. 7444 of 2016(O&M)

M/s Tekno Exports

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

2. CWP No. 9422 of 2016(O&M)

M/s Malik Buildcon Pvt. Ltd.

..... Petitioner

versus

The State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

3. CWP No. 11229 of 2016(O&M)

M/s Anand Singh & Company and another

..... Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

4. CWP No. 13005 of 2016(O&M)

Aleron Consultants(India)Pvt. Ltd.

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CWP No. 7444 of 2016(O&M) 2

5. CWP No. 15494 of 2016(O&M)

M/s Shyam Jaina Ram Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

6. CWP No. 16097 of 2016(O&M)

M/s SRS Natural Resources Limited Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

7. CWP No. 22862 of 2016(O&M)

M/s Tekno Exports Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

(215)

8. CWP No. 1255 of 2017(O&M)

M/s Sangam Infra Estate Pvt. Ltd. Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

216

9. CWP No. 10145 of 2017(O&M)

M/s Antheia Proprieties Private Limited Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

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

Present: Mr.Vikram Singh, Advocate;
Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Sr. Advocate with
Mr.Shekhar Verma, Advocate;
Mr.B.S.Rana, Sr. Advocate with
Ms.Gagandeep Rana, Advocate;
Mr.Anand Chhibber, Sr. Advocate with
Ms.Riya Bansal, Advocate;
Mr.Akshay Bhan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr.Alok Mittal, Advocate;
Mr.Ravinder Malik(Ravi) Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr.Amar Vivek, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr.Pankaj Gupta, Senior Panel Advocate
for respondent-UOI .

Mr.K.L.Saini, Advocate
for Mr.Rajesh Sheoran, Advocate
for respondent No.4 in CWP-1255-2017.

SURYA KANT, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the parties are ad idem that in view of the judgment dated 29.11.2016 rendered by a Coordinate Bench in CWP No. 20206 of 2016, M/s Delhi Royalty Company, Yamuna Nagar v. State of Haryana and others, the impugned orders in these cases, restraining the petitioners from carrying out mechanised mining, are liable to be set aside, of course, with liberty to the State Government to pass fresh orders after hearing the parties concerned. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say that the petitioners also shall be at liberty to raise their allied grievances, if any, by way of the representations/supplementary representations which may be made within one month. The competent party shall pass speaking orders within a period of four months after the expiry of one month period granted

to the petitioners to supplement their claims. Ordered accordingly.

With these observations, the aforesaid writ petitions stand disposed of.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

November 08, 2017
sunita

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No