

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

224

CWP-20058-2020

Date of decision: 14.12.2020

Smt. Kanta Rani and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.N. SATYANARAYANA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

PRESENT: Mr. Ankit Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Naresh Chhokar, Advocate for respondent No. 7.

S.N. SATYANARAYANA, J. (ORAL)

The matter has been taken up through video conferencing in the light of COVID-19 pandemic.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that dispute between the petitioners and respondents is duly settled and, therefore, the present writ petition does not survive for consideration.

However, at this juncture, learned counsel for the State would submit that this writ petition itself is frivolous that the petitioners having some grievance against the contesting respondent, with reference to the private land which has got nothing to do with the lease area which is meant for the respondents and the photographs which have produced would indicate the land, with reference to the lands which are leased in favour of the respondents by State.

However, we would not like to go into the merits of this case and the submissions of learned counsel for both the parties are placed on record which could be utilized by the State, at the later stage, if, there is an attempt to reopen this matter.

With such observations, this petition is disposed of as having become infructuous, at the instance of learned counsel for the petitioner.

(S.N. SATYANARAYANA)
JUDGE

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

December 14, 2020
rishu

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No