

202

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

COCP No.1064 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.03.2018

MINDER AND OTHERS

..... Petitioners

Versus

**SH. ARUN KUMAR GUPTA, IAS, FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER
AND PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVT. OF HARYANA, DEPTT.
OF TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING, CHANDIGARH**

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Vineet Sehgal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. D.K. Mittal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners had filed a writ petition bearing *CWP No.20632 of 2011*, seeking quashing of the notification dated 12.12.2008 issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 as also notification dated 11.12.2009 issued under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, acquiring their land.

The aforesaid writ petition was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 19.10.2015 (**Annexure P-1 colly**) alongwith other connected petitions, the relevant part of the order is as under:-

“ *In view of what has been recorded hereinabove, we dispose of the writ petitions by accepting the prayer of the petitioners that their*

applications for licences could not have been rejected by invoking clause VII(2) of the Draft Development Plan of Gurgaon and consequently direct the State of Haryana to consider in the light of the aforesaid facts whether the petitioners fall within the policy of release and if so, in the exercise of power under Section 48 of the 1894 Act, pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. The State of Haryana would be at liberty to consider the rights of the petitioners who have not filed objections under Section 5-A of the 1894 Act. ”

Thereafter, the review filed by the petitioners also was dismissed vide order dated 12.02.2016 (**Annexure P-2**) with a direction to the respondents to '*comply with the directions issued in judgment dated 19.10.2015 (P-1), expeditiously within three months.*'

Since the needful was not done within the stipulated time of three months, hence, the present contempt petition.

Upon notice, a reply has been filed, wherein it is stated that after hearing the petitioners, a speaking order dated 25.04.2017 (**Annexure R-1**) has been passed, whereby it is decided that as the Hon'ble Supreme Court had stayed all the actions taken by the State Government on the basis of policy decision, therefore, no final decision can be taken on the request of the petitioners till further orders in view of pending *SLP No.28411 of 2011*, titled as '*Kishore Chhabra versus State of Haryana and others*'. A copy of the speaking order dated 25.04.2017 (**R-1**) has also been conveyed to the petitioners.

In view of the stand taken in the reply, learned State Counsel states that no further action in the present contempt petition is warranted,

and the same is liable to be dismissed as infructuous.

Dismissed as infructuous.

March 07, 2018
'anjali/rajneesh'

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No