

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

1. Date of Decision : 27.10.2021
CWP-18734-2020 (O&M)

Inderjit Yadav --Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others --Respondents

2 CWP-18590-2020

Lalit Yadav and others --Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others --Respondents

3 CWP-19560-2020

Dayaram --Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others --Respondents

4 CWP-19583-2020

Gian Chand --Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others --Respondents

5 CWP-19640-2020

Pushpender --Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

6

CWP-19739-2020

Ved Pal

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

7

CWP-20183-2020

Mahinder Singh and another

--Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

8

CWP-20315-2020

Maha Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

9

CWP-20350-2020

Ajay Chauhan and others

--Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

10

CWP-20888-2020

Rajiv Thakran

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| 11 | CWP-20951-2020 |
| Raj Singh | --Petitioner |
| Versus | |
| State of Haryana and others | --Respondents |
| | |
| 12 | CWP-21072-2020 |
| Sher Singh | --Petitioner |
| Versus | |
| State of Haryana and others | --Respondents |
| | |
| 13 | CWP-22388-2020 |
| Parampal | --Petitioner |
| Versus | |
| State of Haryana and others | --Respondents |
| | |
| 14 | CWP-340-2021 |
| Geeta | --Petitioner |
| Versus | |
| State of Haryana and others | --Respondents |
| | |
| 15 | CWP-3569-2021 |
| Satish Sharma and others | --Petitioners |
| Versus | |
| State of Haryana and others | --Respondents |
| | |
| 16 | CWP-4447-2021 |

Ballo Devi

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

17

CWP-5043-2021

Joginder Singh and another

--Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

18

CWP-6290-2021

Balbir Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

19

CWP-6695-2021

Avtar Chand

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

20

CWP-6974-2021

Balwinder and another

--Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

21

CWP-7005-2021

Banto

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

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

Present:- Mr.Sandeep Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner (s) in CWP Nos.18734, 19560, 19583, 19640,
20350, 22388 of 2020 and CWP Nos.3569, 5043, 6290, 6695,
6974, 7005 of 2021.

Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Divyam Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner (s) in CWP Nos.18590, 19739, 20183, 20315,
20888, 20951, 21072 of 2020 and CWP-340-2021.

Mr. Sachin Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-4447-2021.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate and
Mr. Rajesh K.Sheoran, Advocate
for respondent-HSVP.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J.

This order shall dispose of CWP-18734-2020 (Inderjit Yadav
Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-18590-2020 (Lalit Yadav and
others Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-19560-2020 (Dayaram
Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-19583-2020 (Gian Chand
Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-19640-2020 (Pushpender
Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-19739-2020 (Ved Pal Versus
State of Haryana and others), CWP-20183-2020 (Mahinder Singh and
another Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-20315-2020 (Maha
Singh Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-20350-2020 (Ajay
Chauhan and others Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-20888-
2020 (Rajiv Thakran Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-20951-
2020 (Raj Singh Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-21072-2020

(Sher Singh Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-22388-2020 (Parampal Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-340-2021 (Geeta Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-3569-2021 (Satish Sharma and others Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-4447-2021 (Ballo Devi Versus State of Haryana and others) CWP-5043-2021 (Joginder Singh and another Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-6290-2021 (Balbir Singh Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-6695-2021 (Avtar Chand Versus State of Haryana and others), CWP-6974-2021 (Balwinder and another Versus State of Haryana and others) and CWP-7005-2021 (Banto Versus State of Haryana and others) as the issue involved in the bunch of petitions is identical.

Petitioner(s) are essentially aggrieved of the action of the respondent-Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran in not considering their claim for allotment of plot(s) under the oustee's quota on the ground that they were not the original land owners as on the date of issuance of the notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, learned counsel representing the respondent-Pradhikaran informs that during the pendency of these writ petitions, the matter has been re-considered and a decision has been taken in principle that LRs of the original land owners would also be considered as eligible under the oustee's quota. He further submits that pursuant to such decision, the instructions dated 10.09.2020 which are a subject matter of challenge in these petitions stand withdrawn.

The decision that has now been taken is by virtue of memo dated 26.10.2021 on the subject of settlement of Outstee's Claims-Terms and Conditions thereon. A copy of the same has been furnished to all the counsel representing the petitioner(s) in this bunch of petitions.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, learned counsel representing the petitioner(s) in CWP Nos.18734, 19560, 19583, 19640, 20350, 22388 of 2020 and CWP Nos.3569, 5043, 6290, 6695, 6974, 7005 of 2021 contends that even such decision cannot sustain inasmuch as it runs contrary to the dictum laid down by the Full Bench of this Court in Rajiv Manchanda's case in CWP No.22252 of 2016 decided on 22.11.2017 as also the Division Bench judgment in Sandeep Kumar's case in LPA No.2096 of 2011 decided on 25.04.2012.

We, however, refrain from expressing our opinion in the matter as there is no challenge laid to the decision now taken and contained in memo dated 26.10.2021.

Writ petitions are disposed of.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Needless to observe that it would always be open for the petitioner(s) to raise a challenge to memo dated 26.10.2021, a copy of which has been supplied to counsel for the petitioner(s) in Court today and on all grounds as may be available in accordance with law.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

27.10.2021
anju

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |