

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

115

CRM No.M-14983 of 2018

Date of decision:23.4.2018

Partap Singh

... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH.

Present: Mr.S.S.Rangi, Advocate,
for the petitioner
Mr.J.S.Walia, Sr.DAG, Punjab
Mr.R.K.Shukla, Advocate,
for respondents no.4 to 8
...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Pursuant to notice issued, Mr.Shukla, Advocate, appears for respondents no.4 to 8 and fairly submits that in fact the impugned order, Annexure P-10, has already been implemented on the spot, except to the extent that the boundary wall of the premises of the petitioner has not been demolished. He very fairly submits that along with the revision petition filed by the present petitioner against the impugned order, before the Additional Sessions Judge, an application seeking stay of the impugned order dated 13.2.2018 has also been filed and till the decision of the stay application, the boundary wall of the petitioners' premises may not be demolished.

The statement of Mr.Shukla is very fair and in any case till such time as the stay application is decided by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, the boundary wall of the petitioners' premises would not be demolished.

It is also pointed out that an application for restoration of 1 *karam* of the passage in question (to the petitioner) has also been filed before the Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala, along with the revision petition.

Naturally, an appropriate order would be passed by that Court, on that application also.

Consequently, this petition is disposed of with the aforesaid direction, to the effect that the boundary wall and other structures existing on the spot be not demolished till decision of the application seeking stay of the impugned order, by the revisional Court (of the learned Additional Sessions Judge).

23.4.2018
pk

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No