

112 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
 AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-16440-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:25.08.2021

Anil Kumar

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Navneet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL)

This case has been taken up through Video Conferencing via Webex facility in the light of Pandemic Covid-19 situation and as per instructions.

Petitioner seeks a mandamus directing the official respondents to provide a 33 ft. wide passage leading to his land/factory.

We find that at Annexure P-5 is an order dated 04.09.2013 in terms of which a 2 *Karam* (11 ft.) passage has been provided to the petitioner's land.

Averments made in the instant petition are that such order dated 04.09.2013 (Annexure P-5) was never communicated to the petitioner. Be that as it may, counsel during the course of hearing would concede that such passage of 2 *Karams* (11 ft.) is being used by the petitioner.

We find that essentially the relief sought in the instant petition is towards setting aside/modification of the order dated 04.09.2013 (Annexure P-5) and thereafter to be provided a wider passage.

In the writ petition the order dated 04.09.2013 (Annexure P-5) has not been assailed even to the limited extent of providing a passage of 2 *Karams* (11 ft.) which, as per the petitioner, is insufficient.

Confronted with such a situation, counsel seeks withdrawal of the writ petition with liberty to take necessary remedial steps.

Disposed of as withdrawn.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

25.08. 2021
sunita

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