

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

COCP No.9 of 2015

Date of Order: 13.07.2018

Tek Ram Dahiya

....Petitioner

Versus

P Raghvendera Rao and Ors.

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Hardeep Singh Dhillon, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate for the respondents.

JASWANT SINGH, J (ORAL)

The land of the petitioner was acquired for the development of Sector 17, Panipat vide Notification dated 23.2.1989/22.2.1990 issued under Sections 4 & 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 respectively. The award was pronounced on 21.2.1992. The petitioner challenged the acquisition by filing CWP No.18740 of 1991 along with other land owners and the same was dismissed by this Court on 18.5.2011. The SLP also stands dismissed.

The petitioner thereafter filed CWP No.23413 of 2013, seeking directions to the respondents-HUDA to provide basic infrastructure and carry out development activities. This Court vide order dated 24.10.2013 disposed of the petition with direction to take requisite steps in accordance with law.

Since no visible steps have been taken to comply with the directions passed on 24.10.2013, present contempt petition has been

preferred.

Upon notice, a reply has been filed on behalf of HUDA Authorities.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and scrutinizing the pleadings, it is borne out that most of the area in the Sector stands developed whereas some of the portion remains under unauthorized occupation. The petitioner himself is stated to be in illegal possession over the land in question, which made it almost impossible to carry out the development work in the encroached area. It is further clear that steps have been taken to remove the encroachment by the HUDA by issuance of appropriate notices under Section 18 of the Haryana Urban Development Authority Act, 1977.

In conspectus of the above facts, this Court is satisfied that substantial steps have been taken for compliance of the order, hence no further action is warranted.

Disposed of.

Rule discharged.

July 13, 2018
manoj

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

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