

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1. CWP-16428-1998
Date of Decision: July 09, 2018

M/s Methodox Systems Limited

.....Petitioner

Versus

Estate Officer, Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

.....Respondents

and

2. CWP-19140-1998

Chandigarh Optical Centre through its proprietor, Sukhdev Sharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA**

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr.Tarun Walia, Advocate
for respondent No.1 in CWP-16428-1998
for respondent Nos.1 to 3 in CWP-19140-1998

.....

SURYA KANT, J.(ORAL)

This order shall dispose of the above captioned writ petitions as
the point in issue involved in both the cases is common in nature.

[2] On January 09, 2018, counsel for the Union Territory,
Chandigarh was directed to find out whether anything survives in these writ
petitions or not?

[3] Learned counsel for UT, Chandigarh has shown the original

inspection report in respect of SCO No.45-46-47, Sector 17A, Chandigarh, which is to the following effect:-

Sr.No.	Observations	Present status	Remarks
1.	Shop sub(sic) divided against sanctioned plan	Still exist at site	Sanctionability through submission of Revised Building Plan and subject to be approval by PAC
2.	First Floor planning has been changed against sanctioned plan	Stil exist at site	Sanctionability through submission of Revised Building Plan and subject to be approval by PAC
3.	Glazing not as per submitted plan at Third Floor, i.e. against Architectural control	Still exist at site	Neither sanctionable nor compoundable

The occupiers of the above said site are as under:-

Ground Floor

- 1. Bansal Property
- 2. Nand Travels
- 3. Jockey

Second Floor

- 1. Aviva Life Insurance

Third Floor

- 1. Buzz”

[4] Learned counsel thus submits that as per the Inspection report, the petitioners (M/s Methodox Systems Limited and Chandigarh Optical Centre) are no longer in occupation of the ground floor of the premises. The present occupiers of the ground floor have not come forward and sought their impleadment in these proceedings. It is for this reason that no one has been appearing on behalf of the petitioners on the last several dates.

[5] Since the petitioners have vacated the premises, the instant writ petitions qua them have become infructuous and the same are disposed of accordingly but without prejudice to the rights of the present occupiers, if any, which they may avail separately in accordance with law.

**(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE**

July 09, 2018
meenuss

**(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE**

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned ? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable ? | Yes/No |