

236

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

**CM No.2428-CII of 2019 and
CM No.11470-CII of 2018 in/and
COCP No.965 of 2014
Date of Decision: 22.10.2019**

Bhai Dilawar Singh and another

Petitioners

Versus

Baljit Singh, District Development and Panchayat Officer, Sangrur
and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. R.S. Bains, Advocate
for the applicants/petitioners.

Mr. A.S. Salar, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Ms. Deepali Puri, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

None for respondent No.3.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

CM No.2428-CII of 2019

This is an application for placing on record the replication
on behalf of the petitioner.

CM is allowed, replication is taken on record.

CM No.11470-CII of 2018

This is an application for fixing an actual date of hearing
of COCP No.965 of 2014.

Learned counsel for the non-applicants have no objection

if the application is allowed.

With the consent of all the parties, matter is taken up for hearing on merits today itself.

Main Case:

The writ petition was filed by the petitioner raising grievance that the resolution proposing action to be taken against unauthorised occupants of land of *Gram Panchayat* of Village *Bagrian* is not proceed with to get the land vacated. The petition was allowed on 07.11.2013 by issuing directions to the Gram Panchayat to take action against the unauthorised occupants. The District Development and Panchayat Officer, Sangrur was directed to look into the grievance raised in the legal notice.

Status Report filed today, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for respondent No.1 submits that total 135 encroachments were identified in which eviction proceedings were initiated under Section 7 of the Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961. Out of these, appeals have been filed in 76 cases, warrants of possession were issued in 59 cases and 11 houses have been demolished. Further 48 houses could not be demolished, as per the revenue authorities, there were some complications in doing so.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that needful would be done in the 76 cases after decision of the appeals. He further assures that remaining warrants of possession against 48 encroachers would be executed expeditiously, in case there are no

legal impediments.

In view of statement made, the contempt petition is disposed of.

There is no doubt that in case request is made to the appellate authority for expeditious disposal of the appeals, the same would be considered in accordance with law.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

October 22, 2019

pankaj baweja

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