

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

**COCP No. 507 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 20.02.2018**

Harish Chand and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

T.L. Satya Parkash, Director General, Urban Estate
Department, Haryana, Chandigarh and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Ms. Ramandeep Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Indresh Goel, Additional Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondents.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners, four in number, had filed a writ petition bearing *CWP No. 9098 of 2014*, seeking quashing of the notifications dated 08.03.1989 and 07.03.1990 issued under Sections 4 & 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, as also the consequent Award dated 05.02.2002, whereby their land had been acquired by the respondent-State of Haryana. The said writ petition was disposed of by a Division Bench of this Court, vide order dated 07.10.2015 (**Annexure P-1**), with the following operative directions:-

“ Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the cases, these petitions are disposed of by granting liberty to the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation raising all the pleas as raised in the writ petitions 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. It is, however, made clear that in case no such representation is filed within the stipulated period as noticed above, the interim order shall cease to operate, thereafter. ”

Upon notice, a reply dated 01.08.20107 stands filed, wherein in para No. 5, it is stated that in compliance of order dated 07.10.2015 **(P-1)**, a speaking order dated 29.06.2017 **(Annexure R-1)** has been passed, copy of the same has also been sent to all the concerned, including the petitioners.

In view of above, learned State Counsel states that since the speaking order has been passed, therefore, no further action in the present contempt petition is warranted, as the same has become infructuous.

Learned counsel for the petitioners also concedes the aforesaid factual position.

Dismissed as infructuous.

Since the main case has been decided, therefore, no further orders are required to be passed in the pending applications, if any.

February 20, 2018

'dk kamra'

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**

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