

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-31993-2019

Date of Decision: 19.11.2019

Satnam Singh

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL**

Present: - Mr.Amrinderjit Singh Sandhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J. (ORAL)

The application under Section 7 of the Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961 [for short 'the Act'], filed by the Gram Panchayat against the private respondents No.5 & 6, was dismissed on 15.3.2011 against which appeal filed by respondent No.7 (Gram Panchayat) was allowed on 27.9.2012 and the matter was remanded back to respondent No.3 to decide the same afresh within a period of three months.

The grievance of the petitioner is that the period of three months has since long been expired but so far the matter has not been decided in one way or the other. He has thus prayed for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct respondent No.3, who is seized of the application filed by the Gram Panchayat, to decide the same in terms of the order dated 27.9.2012 within the time prescribed.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr.Shreesh Gupta, Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4 only. Since the

direction is to be issued to respondent No.3, who has to decide the application pending under Section 7 of the Act, therefore, we do not find any merit to issue notice to rest of the respondents.

After hearing counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the writ petition is hereby disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to decide the application under Section 7 of the Act, filed by respondent No.7 (Gram Panchayat), as early as possible, preferably within a period of six months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this Court.

Mr.Shreesh Gupta, Sr. DAG, Punjab is also directed to convey the order of this Court to respondent No.3 for compliance.

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

19.11.2019

Vivek

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable : *Yes/No*