

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

CWP-9468-2017

Date of Decision: 08.02.2018

ISHWAR DEEN & ORS.

....Petitioners.

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS .

...Respondents.

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

Present: Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate for
the respondents/HUDA.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

The petitioners have sought quashing of show cause notice dated 26.04.2017 appended as Annexure P-10 by way of present writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India.

2. It has been claimed that the petitioners are entitled for rehabilitation under the HUDA Act, Rules and Policies. A prayer was made by learned counsel for the petitioners that this petition be disposed of at this stage by permitting the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation raising all the claims as sought to be raised in the present writ petition and appending all the necessary and relevant documents along with the same. It

was, however, prayed that time-bound directions may be issued to the respondents to decide the same by passing a speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners. A further prayer was made that some time may be provided to the petitioners to approach this Court again, in case, any adverse order is passed by the authorities.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents pleads no objection to the aforesaid.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, perusing the averments made in the writ petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the controversy, we dispose of the present writ petition by permitting the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation appending all the necessary and relevant documents within two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order before respondent No.2-Chief Administrator. In case, such representation is filed, the same shall be decided by respondent No.2 within a period of next two months, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, by passing a speaking order, in accordance with law.

5. It is further observed that in case while deciding aforesaid representation, any adverse order is passed by respondent No.2, the same shall not be given effect to and no

demolition shall take effect for a period of one month after passing of the order by respondent No.2.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

08.02.2018
SwarnjitS