

210

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

**COCP No.1244 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.02.2018**

SUKHPAL AND OTHERS

..... PETITIONERS

VERSUS

**P. RAGHVENDER RAO, IAS, COMMISSIONER TOWN AND
COUNTRY PLANNING URBAN ESTATE DEPARTMENT, HARYANA**

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Akshay Kumar Jindal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Indresh Goel, Additional Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The writ petition bearing *CWP No.6857 of 2015*, filed by the petitioners, seeking mandamus directions to the respondent(s) for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the notifications dated 04.04.1998 issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and dated 06.04.1998 under Section 6 having lapsed in view of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, was disposed of vide order dated 10.04.2015 (**Annexure P-1**), with a direction to '*the petitioner to make a detailed and comprehensive representation raising all the pleas as raised in the writ petition before the appropriate authority.*' Relevant portion of the

order dated 10.04.2015 (P-1) is reproduced as under:-

“ After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, perusing the present petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we dispose of the present petition by granting liberty to the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation raising all the pleas as raised in the present writ petition before the appropriate authority. It is directed that in the event of a representation being filed by the petitioners within a period of two months from today, the same shall be decided in accordance with law by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to them within a period of four months from the date of receipt of representation. The petitioners shall be entitled to lead any evidence to substantiate their claim before the concerned authority. Till the matter is decided by the said authority, status quo shall be maintained by the parties. ”

Upon notice, a reply has been filed, wherein it is stated that the speaking order has been passed on 03.08.2016 (**Annexure R-1**), which is conveyed to the petitioners.

In view of above, counsel for the respondent states that nothing more survives in the present contempt petition, as the same has become infructuous.

Dismissed as infructuous.

However, if the petitioners are still aggrieved, they are free to challenge the aforesaid speaking order.

February 08, 2018

'rajneesh'

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>