

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

RA-CW-263-2021 (O&M)

In CWP-14810-2002

Date of Decision: 03.03.2023

KAMLA DEVI

. . . . Review Applicant/Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO.
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.**

Present Mr. Anil Kumar Saini, Advocate for
 Mr. Shashi Kant Gupta, Advocate
 for the review applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO, J. (Oral)

This Review Application is filed seeking review of the order dt.17.11.2020 in *CWP-14810-2002* passed by this Court.

Vide the said order, a Division Bench of this Court had dismissed the Writ Petition on the ground of non-prosecution, and also on the ground that an identical challenge to the very same land acquisition proceedings by way of *CWP-11009-2002 in Vidhya Devi vs. State of Haryana*, on which reliance was placed in the Writ Petition, stood negated by this Court, and also that another *CWP-13847-2002 in Reshmi Devi vs. State of Haryana*, identically challenging the same land acquisition proceedings, had also been dismissed.

One of the grounds on which review is sought is that at the time when the Writ Petition was listed on 17.11.2020, the counsel for the

petitioner had represented that he was no longer the counsel for the writ petitioner and one Mr. Munish Gupta had entered appearance for the petitioner.

The Court in the impugned order noticed that on 30.11.2014, a *vakalatnama* had been filed by one Mr. Shashi Kant Gupta, Advocate, but when the matter was called out, he also did not appear before the Court, and there is no indication that Mr. Munish Gupta had filed *vakalatnama* for the petitioner.

Since the matter appears to have been decided against the petitioner without hearing the counsel for the petitioner, in the interest of justice, we deem it appropriate to allow the Review Application, and recall the order dt.17.11.2020 passed in *CWP No.14810 of 2022*, and restore the said Writ Petition to its original number to the file of this Court, and direct that *status quo* as on date be maintained.

Both parties are permitted to take additional pleadings in the Writ Petition, if so advised.

List as per Roster.

Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO)
JUDGE

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

March 03, 2023

Mohit goyal

1. *Whether speaking/reasoned?*
2. *Whether reportable?*

Yes/No
Yes/No