

228

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

**COCP No.3436 of 2018
Date of Decision: 17.12.2019**

Mahender Singh

Petitioner

Versus

Apoorva Kumar Singh, Principal Secretary to the Government of
Haryana and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Sunish Bindlish, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

Mr. Sandeep S. Mann, Sr. D.A.G., Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The petitioner filed a writ petition claiming that acquisition lapsed with the flux of time as neither the possession of acquired land was taken nor compensation paid. The writ petition was disposed of on 30.11.2017.

The relevant portion of the order is reproduced below:-

“After hearing learned counsel for the parties, we find that the important projects for infrastructure development should not be kept on hold only for the reason that certain issues regarding challenge to the acquisition are pending, especially for the reason that the State has decided not to contest those cases and offer the landowners equivalent land in exchange, hence, the acquisition of land required for

Eastern Peripheral Expressway is upheld. However, it is directed that whatever area of land is to be given to the petitioners in exchange, the needful shall be done within a period of four months.”

The grievance raised in the contempt petition is that an alternative land was allotted to the petitioner with onerous conditions i.e. (i) land would be used only for agricultural purpose and (ii) it shall not be converted by getting the 'Change of land use'.

During the pendency of contempt petition, the Chief Administrator, HUDA and Principal Secretary, Department of Urban Estate were present in the Court and assured that matter would be looked into.

Today, learned State counsel submits that decision has been taken not to impose the above mentioned two conditions.

Learned State counsel submits that order to the said effect would be communicated to the petitioner. The needful, if any, for compliance of directions of this Court would be done expeditiously.

In view of above, no further interference is called for in the contempt proceedings, the petition is disposed of.

However, petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law in case grievance still survives.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

December 17, 2019

pankaj baweja

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No