

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.21784 of 2018
Date of Decision: 2.11.2018

Raj Kamal and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CWP No. 22801 of 2018

Sukhwinder Kaur and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

AND

CWP No. 24497 of 2018

Charan Dass and another

..Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present: Mr. A.K. Kansal, Advocate for the petitioners in (CWP No.21784 of 2017).

Mr. R.S. Kundu, Advocate for the petitioners in (CWP No. 22801 of 2018).

Mr. Hardeep Singh Dhillon, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioners in
(CWP No.24497 of 2018).

Mr. B.R.Mahajan, Advocate General, Haryana with
Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Rajesh K.Sheoran, advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. A.S. Sehra, Advocate for respondent No.6 (in CWP No.
22801 of 2018).

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of three petitions bearing CWP No. 21784 of 2018 titled as Raj Kamal and others Vs. State of Haryana and others (for short 'the first petition'), CWP No. 22801 of 2018 titled as Sukhwinder Kaur and others Vs. State of Haryana and others (for short 'the second petition') and CWP No. 24497 of 2018 titled as Charan Dass and another Vs. State of Haryana and others (for short 'the third petition') as the issue involved in all these petitions is common.

Shorn of unnecessary details, the grievance of the petitioners in these petitions is that their objections to the proposed *Ward Bandi*, notified on 11.4.2018 by the Urban Local Bodies Department, were not considered by the competent authority much less the Secretary of Department. The learned Advocate General has stated at the bar that the objection of the petitioners, pertaining to the Ward Bandi of MC Panipat, would now be considered and decided afresh by the Secretary of Department in terms of the provisions of Haryana Municipal Corporation Ward Delimitation Rules, 1994. It is also submitted that earlier decisions taken and on the basis of which notification dated 16.7.2018 was issued about the Ward Bandi would be considered to have been rendered infructuous or redundant.

Thus, in view of the aforesaid, all the three petitions are hereby disposed of in view of the concession made by the learned Advocate General Haryana referred to here-in-above and it is needless to mention that the

Secretary of Department while deciding the objections of the petitioners would pass speaking order.

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge

(Anupinder Singh Grewal)
Judge

November 2, 2018
Meenu

Whether speaking / reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No