

114 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

SMRITI
2021.09.13 10:05
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

CWP-17889-2021

Date of Decision: 10.09.2021

HARPAL SINGH

... PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.. RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present : Mr. Kushagra Mahajan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Bahri, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA , J.(ORAL)

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

Petitioner seeks issuance of a writ of *certiorari* for quashing the notification dated 21.10.2012 (Annexure P-2) claiming the same to be illegal and *ultra vires* of the provisions of the Haryana Municipal Act, 1973.

At the very outset, we may notice that notification dated 21.10.2012 (Annexure P-2) is only a Draft Development Plan relating to Farukh Nagar.

It is the pleaded case of the petitioner himself that he had submitted objections dated 16.09.2012 at Annexure P-3 and which are still pending.

We are of the considered view that no intervention at this stage is called for.

Since an advance copy of the petition has already been served upon the State of Haryana, Mr. Aman Bahri, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, on instruction from Mr. Vijay, District Town Planner, NCR, Region, informs us that the matter is still under consideration and the objections dated 16.09.2012 (Annexure P-3) that had been filed by the petitioner would be duly considered as per law before finalizing the Draft Development Plan.

In the light of such stand taken on behalf of the State, no further directions are required to be passed.

Petition is disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

10.09.2021

smriti

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