

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

109

**Civil Writ Petition No.10799 of 2018  
Date of decision: May 02, 2018**

Parmjit Singh Chhina and others

....Petitioners

versus

The State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL***

\*\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Shailendra Jain, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Satyendra Chauhan, Advocate and  
Mr. Harman Jivtesh Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioners have approached this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in continuing the subject Timber Market and Truck Stand etc. scheme as modified vide notification (**Annexure P-21**), qua the land of the petitioners and other vacant lands in vicinity, on papers, notwithstanding the same having been practically abandoned de-facto, since long in view of the facts and circumstances, is violative of Articles 14 & 300A of the Constitution of India. Further prayer has also been made to quash the action of the respondents vide a notification dated 23.01.2015 (**Annexure P-21**) along with layout plan drawing No.PIT/366/14, dated 17.12.2014 (Annexure P-19) allegedly altering the scheme by itself is in the teeth of

-----

the provisions of Section 43 of the Punjab Town Improvement Act, 1922.

2. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, perusing the present writ petition and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present writ petition is disposed of by granting liberty to the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation collectively raising all the pleas as well as any supplementary plea arising from the present matter as sought to be raised in the present writ petition before respondent No.1 within one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, such a representation is filed, the same shall be decided by respondent No.1 by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners within next three months in accordance with law.

**(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**May 02, 2018**  
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned?  
Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No