

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-16013-2023

Date of decision:16.11.2023

Ramnish Gupta

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL**

**Present: Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

**Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate,
for the respondents-HSVP.**

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

On August, 07, 2023, this Court had passed the following
order:-

*“Mr. Sabherwal has submitted that a
communication has been received from the Estate Officer,
HSVP, Faridabad-respondent No.4 that where SCO
Nos.157 to 176, Sector 16, Faridabad have been carved out
by HSVP, it was not a green belt and the site was reserved
for public and semi public building as per the layout cum
demarcation plan of shopping centre dated 08.02.1995,
which was duly revised on 06.07.2023. However, qua
residential plots which were also slated to be proposed in
the said belt, information has not been received and he
prays for time to file a composite affidavit regarding both
the aspects so that the matter can be adjudicated upon.*

Adjourned to 18.09.2023”.

In response thereto, an affidavit of the Estate Officer, HSVP, Faridabad, on behalf of the respondents, was filed on the previous date of hearing, i.e. November 09, 2023, and paragraph 3 thereof, reads as thus:-

“That in this regard, it is submitted that as per DTP demarcation plan No.DTP(F)1706/95 dated 08.02.1995, the site in question was initially planned for the Public and semi public building i.e. commercial site and thereafter vide DTP drawing bearing no.DTP (F) CTP/DTP/(PB) AG/149718 dated 06.07.2023, the same was re-planned for carving out for Shop-cum-Office (SCO) in which 20 nos of SCO have been planned i.e. SCO No.157 to 176, sector-16, Faridabad. Hence, the use of land was/is same. It is also submitted that in the revised layout plan neither green belt has been re-planned/disturbed nor residential plot has been planned. A copy of drawing/layout plan dated 08.02.1995 and 06.07.2023 are annexed as Annexure R-1 & R-2.”

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in the wake of the specific stand set out above, nothing substantive survives in the petition and the same be disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous.

To which, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the response (*ibid*), submitted by the authorities, does not completely redress the grievances of the petitioner, but let this petition be disposed of, in terms of the statement made by learned counsel for the

respondents. However, if the petitioner would still have any grievance, he be permitted to move the authorities by filing a representation, in this regard.

In response, learned counsel for the respondents submits that despite the stand taken by the authorities, if the petitioner still moves any such representation, the same shall be taken cognizance of by the authorities. And, the necessary orders, in accordance with law, shall be passed thereon, as expeditiously as possible.

The petition is accordingly disposed of, in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

16.11.2023
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No