

114

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

CWP-26335-2018

Date of decision-11.10.2018

Rajesh Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Harish Mehla, Advocate for the petitioner.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for the issuance of a writ, in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.3 to deliver the possession of plot No.19; directing respondents to compensate for the loss of one harvest of kharif crop caused due to non delivery of possession of land leased out to the petitioner and further directing respondent Nos.1 and 2 to take disciplinary action against concerned officers for dereliction of their duties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.4-Deputy Commissioner, Kaithal, Mini Secretariat, Karnal Road, Kaithal (Haryana) to consider and decide the legal notice dated 27.08.2018 (Annexure P-10).

Heard.

In view of the above, without advertng to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.4-

Deputy Commissioner, Kaithal, Mini Secretariat, Karnal Road, Kaithal (Haryana) to consider and decide the legal notice dated 27.08.2018 (Annexure P-10) within three weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of the order. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

11.10.2018

vanita

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