

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

108

**Civil Writ Petition No.835 of 2018
Date of decision: January 17, 2018**

Harish Kalra

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Om Parkash Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Vishal Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, impugning the order dated 28.12.2010 (**Annexure P-8**) passed by the Administrator, HUDA, Faridabad, exercising the power of the Chief Administrator, HUDA and order dated 26.07.2010 (**Annexure P-6**) passed by the Estate Officer, HUDA, Faridabad-respondent No.4, resuming the residential plot of the petitioner and for quashing letter dated 21.12.2015 (**Annexure P-13**) issued by respondent No.4 directing the petitioner to deposit a sum of ₹ 2,21,87,687/- for considering the restoration of the plot. Further prayer has also been made to direct respondent No.1 to hear and decide the revision petition dated 06.04.2011 (**Annexure P-9**) filed by the petitioner against the resumption order.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that against the impugned notice dated 21.12.2015 (Annexure P-13), demanding ₹ 2,21,87,687/-, a representation had been filed by the petitioner to the concerned authority, wherein it has been stated that a revision petition, against the orders dated 26.07.2010 and 28.12.2010 (Annexures P-6 & P-8) respectively, had been filed on 06.04.2011 (Annexure P-9), which is still pending. Accordingly, a prayer was made that respondent No.1 be directed to hear and decide the revision petition filed by the petitioner on 06.04.2011 (Annexure P-9), in accordance with law.

3. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, perusing the present writ petition and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, we dispose of the present petition by issuing direction to respondent No.1 that in case, a revision petition dated 06.04.2011 appended as Annexure P-9 with the writ petition had been filed by the petitioner, the same shall be decided expeditiously in accordance with law.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

January 17, 2018
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No