

244-1

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

Date of Decision: 10.09.2019

1. COCP No.670 of 2019

Dharam Singh

Petitioner

Versus

Devender Singh, Principal Secretary to Government of Haryana,
Industrial Department, Panchkula and others

Respondents

2. COCP No.1050 of 2019

Ravi Dutt

Petitioner

Versus

Devender Singh, Principal Secretary to Government of Haryana,
Industrial Department, Panchkula and others

Respondents

3. COCP No.1063 of 2019

Gopi Chand (now deceased) through his LRs

Petitioners

Versus

Devender Singh, Principal Secretary to Government of Haryana,
Industrial Department, Panchkula and others

Respondents

4. COCP No.1081 of 2019

Lal Chand

Petitioner

Versus

Devender Singh, Principal Secretary to Government of Haryana,
Industrial Department, Panchkula and others

Respondents

5. COCP No.1083 of 2019

Sajan Singh

Petitioner

Versus

Devender Singh, Principal Secretary to Government of Haryana,
Industrial Department, Panchkula and others

Respondents

6. COCP No.1109 of 2019

Suresh Kumar

Petitioner

Versus

Devender Singh, Principal Secretary to Government of Haryana,
Industrial Department, Panchkula and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. B.R. Mahajan, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Prateek Mahajan, Advocate
for the respondents [in COCP No.1050 & 1063 of 2019].

Mr. Pankaj Kundra, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate
for the respondent [in COCP No.1109 of 2019].

Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate
for the respondents [in COCP No.1083 & 670 of 2019].

Mr. Lalit Singla, Advocate for
Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate
for the respondents [in COCP No.1081 of 2019].

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

These six contempt petitions have been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 09.03.2017 passed by this Court in bunch of writ petitions (main case being CWP No.27525 of 2015).

The relevant portion of the order is reproduced below:-

“[14] We, thus, allow these writ petitions; set-aside the order dated 28.10.2014/15.11.2014 (P-6) and direct the State Government to reconsider its Policy decision in the light of the observations made herein-above and the decisions cited above, and take an appropriate decision within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

[15] If the petitioner(s), whose land has been admittedly acquired for infrastructure projects, are held entitled to, their applications shall be reconsidered on merits for allotment of the plots under the modified R&R Policy. Such a decision shall be taken within a period of two months from the date of decision of the State Government.

[16] If still aggrieved, the petitioner(s) shall be at liberty to approach the appropriate forum.”

Replies have been filed today in the Court, same are taken on record. Copy of replies are handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner. Alongwith the replies, orders have been annexed whereby after reconsideration, claims of the petitioner(s) have been rejected as the Government has declined to modify Rehabilitation & Resettlement Policy dated 09.11.2010.

In view of replies filed, learned counsel for the

petitioner(s) states that no cause of action survives for pursuing the contempt petitions. However, he seeks liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law.

The contempt petitions are disposed of as infructuous, with liberty as prayed for.

The rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

September 10, 2019
pankaj baweja

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