

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.23443 of 2018.

Date of Decision: September 14, 2018

Balbir

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA.

Present: Mr.Sandeep Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

-.-

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

The Zonal Administrator, HUDA-cum-Additional Director, Urban Estate, Rohtak passed an order dated 14.11.2017 asking the petitioner to vacate the premises/land which allegedly belongs to HUDA. The petitioner in his reply-cum-representation dated 07.09.2018 has taken the stand that the acquisition of his land stands lapsed under Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013. It is further averred that residential house at the site is liable to be exempted from acquisition as per Government Policy.

Apprehending demolition of the residential house, the petitioner has filed the instant writ petition.

It is not in dispute that the question of applicability of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 is sub-judice before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) cc 8453 of 2017 (State of Haryana and others versus M/s G.D.Goenka Tourism Corporation Limited and

another). Till the said controversy is decided, it appears that both the parties are required to maintain *status-quo* re: demolition of the existing structures. However, instead of expressing any views on merits, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the Administrator, HUDA, Rohtak to consider the reply submitted by the petitioner and pass a reasoned order in accordance with law and maintain *status-quo* re: demolition till such time.

Dasti.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

September 14, 2018
mohinder

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No