

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

COCN No. 3444 of 2018

DECIDED ON: OCTOBER 29, 2019

ANUP SHARMA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

SARVJIT SINGH AND ANOTHER

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. R.S. Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Samina Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

A writ petition filed by the petitioner seeking direction to the respondents to provide employment under Rehabilitation and Re-settlement Scheme dated 18.11.1993 (for brevity 'Scheme') was disposed of on 04.04.2012 in terms of the decision of this Court in CWP No. 3104 of 2012 titled as **Marid Deen and others vs. State of Punjab and others**; decided on 21.02.2012.

In CWP No. 3104 of 2012, reliance was placed upon the decision of this Court rendered in CWP No. 787 of 2008, titled as “**Dharam Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others**”, decided on 26.11.2009. The said decision has attained finality upto the Supreme Court.

The present petition has been filed pleading that the claim of the petitioner for providing employment under the policy has not been considered by the respondents.

Pursuant to notice of motion, reply by way of affidavit of

Mr. Jagmohan Singh Nagi, Chief Engineer, Ranjit Sagar Dam, Water Resources

Department, Punjab was filed. Along-with the reply, an order dated 29.10.2013 was annexed whereby, the claim of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that 66.66% land of the father of the petitioner was acquired by the Ranjit Sagar Dam Project, which is less than the criteria laid down under the Scheme.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order dated 29.10.2013 is erroneous, as the percentage of land acquired has wrongly been calculated. He further states that on a subsequent enquiry on the request of petitioner, acquired land was found to be 77.27%.

The said aspect cannot be gone into in the contempt proceedings. The directions of this Court have been complied with by considering the case of the petitioner.

Petition is disposed of.

Rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

Needless to add that the petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedy in accordance with law against the order dated 29.10.2013.

OCTOBER 29, 2019
sham

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ***Yes/No***
Whether reportable ***Yes/No***