

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

239

CWP-16690 of 2018
Date of Decision:20.11.2023

Somi Kataria

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Sandeep Jain, Advocate, and
Mr. Sachin Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajneesh Chadwal, AAG, Haryana
for respondents No. 1 and 2.

Mr. Anil Chawla, Advocate,
for respondents No.3 and 4.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing respondents No.1 to 4 to demarcate revenue *rasta* bearing *khasra* No.158 at village Jharsently, Tehsil Ballabgarh, District Faridabad with the help of scientific machine like Total Station Machine with GPS facility and to remove/demolish all encroachments found thereon.
2. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that despite number of representations, no action has been taken by the respondents till date.
3. Learned counsel for respondents No.3 and 4 submits that earlier also the petitioner filed an application but he never deposited the requisite

fee and thus the demarcation as prayed for could not be carried out.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that he will file fresh application alongwith the requisite fee for carrying out the demarcation.

5. In view of the stand taken by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present petition is disposed of with a liberty to the petitioner to file an appropriate application/petition for redressal of his grievances alongwith the requisite fee before respondent No.2 within a period of two weeks from today, then respondent No.2 would ensure that the demarcation as prayed for would be carried out within a period of four weeks from the date of filing of such application.

6. Needless to say if the application, as submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner, is not filed alongwith the requisite fee and required documents, this order would be of no avail to the petitioner.

7. The petitioner would be at liberty to pursue his remedies as per law in case any further cause of action accrues to him.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

November 20, 2023

dinesh

Whether speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No