

104

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

**RA-CR-121-CII-2017 (O&M) IN
CR-3210-2016
Date of decision : 08.09.2017**

Damanjit Kaur

... Applicant(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Ms. Mamta Singla Talwar, DAG, Haryana,
for the review applicant/respondent(s).

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

CM-16293-CII-2017

For the reasons stated in the application, which is duly supported by an affidavit, the delay of 29 days in re-filing the review application is condoned.

CM stands disposed of.

CM-16295-CII-2017

For the reasons stated in the application, which is duly supported by an affidavit, the delay of 347 days in filing the review application is condoned.

CM stands disposed of.

RA-CR-121-CII-2017 (O&M)

Prayer in the application under Section 114 and Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure is for reviewing of the order dated 06.05.2016.

Notice of this application to the non-applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Manohar Lall, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the non-

applicant/petitioner.

It has been brought to the notice of this Court that the order dated 03.12.2009 was challenged by the Sub-Divisional Officer (C)-cum-Prescribed Authority, Jagadhri, on 12.04.2017 and vide order dated 17.08.2017, the appeal preferred by the applicant/respondent(s)-State has been partly accepted to the extent that the ejected tenants are not entitled to accommodation on surplus area as per the provisions of Section 9(A) of the Punjab Security of Land Tenures Act, 1953. The operative part of the order reads as under:-

"In view of the discussion made above, the appeal filed by the appellant is partly allowed to the extent that the ejected tenants are not entitled to accommodation on surplus area under Section 9A of the Punjab Act and the State is not bound to allot land to the respondents No.1 and 3 from the surplus pool. Rest of the order dated 03.12.2009 passed by Assistant Collector 1st Grade, Yamuna Nagar is upheld to the extent of ejectment of respondent No.1 to 3."

In view of such subsequent event, brought to the notice of this Court, I am of the view that no review of the order has been called for, as the order of mine pertained to the compliance of the directions contained in order dated 03.12.2009, which has been modified to the aforementioned extent.

The applicant/respondent(s)/State is at liberty to seek the vindication of their grievance in accordance with law.

Accordingly, the review application stands disposed of in the aforementioned terms.

08.09.2017
Yogesh Sharma

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes**

Whether Reportable **No**