

211-A

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

COCP No.446 of 2019

Date of Decision: 01.07.2019

Ramesh Chander and another

Petitioners

Versus

D. Suresh, IAS, Chief Administrator, HUDA, Panchkula

Respondent

COCP No.447 of 2019

Satyawan

Petitioner

Versus

D. Suresh, IAS, Chief Administrator, HUDA, Panchkula

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Sabharwal, Advocate
for the respondent.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

These two contempt petitions have been filed pleading that there is intentional disobedience of orders dated 28.09.2018 passed by this Court in writ petitions bearing CWP No.7986 of 2018 and CWP No.7342 of 2018.

The operational part of the orders is reproduced below:-

*“[6] We find some force in the contention, especially in the light of the view taken by this Court from time to time including in CWP-5736- 2013, decided on 08.03.2017 (**Krishan Kumar and another vs Haryana Urban Development Authority and others**).*

*While the petitioner would be liable to pay the revised price due to enhancement in compensation, his claim regarding allotment at the rate of 2014 deserves favourable consideration by the Authorities. Since the Estate Officer, Jind, has expressed his helplessness to do so for want of competence, we direct the Chief Administrator, HUDA to re-determine the allotment price of the petitioner in the light of the observations made above and the judgments cited hereinabove. The Chief Administrator, HUDA will also keep in view the Full Bench decision of this Court in CWP-22252-2016 (**Rajiv Manchanda and others vs Haryana Urban Development Authority and another**) decided on 22.11.2017*

[7] Let an appropriate decision be taken within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

[8] Disposed of.”

Learned counsel for the respondent files replies today in Court, same are taken on record. Copy of same are handed over to learned counsel for the petitioners. Alongwith the reply, copy of order re-determining allotment prices has been annexed.

The orders have been complied with, the rule issued against respondent is discharged.

If petitioners have any grievance against the re-determination of price, they are at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law.

Disposed of.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

July 01, 2019
pankaj baweja

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