

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

1. Civil Writ Petition No. 642 of 2023

Aditya Sharma
... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and Others
... Respondent(s)

AND

2. Civil Writ Petition No. 689 of 2023

Jaimal Singh
... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and Others
... Respondent(s)

DATE OF DECISION: 13.01.2023

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Rahul Dev Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Inderpreet Singh Kang, Assistant Advocate General,
Punjab.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. By this order, the two writ petitions (CWP-642-2023 and CWP-689-2023) will be decided.

2. The petitioners pray for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the order dated 02.12.2014 and 02.06.2017, respectively.

3. In substance, the petitioners claim employment under the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Scheme dated 18.11.1993 (hereinafter

referred to as “the Scheme”). The petitioners claim that on account of the compulsory acquisition of their land in the 1990s, they were required to be granted employment under that Scheme.

4. The learned counsel representing the petitioners submits that the respondents have delayed the appointment and failed to implement the Scheme. He submits that in such cases, delay and laches will not come in the way of the petitioners.

5. Such Scheme is to resettle and rehabilitate the oustees on account of the involuntary acquisition of their land. An effort is made by the government to provide an immediate alternative source of income to the oustees. After a passage of nearly 30 years, the entire object of the Scheme ceases to exist. Moreover, the impugned orders were passed on 02.12.2014 and 02.06.2017. The writ petitions have been filed in the months of November and December, 2022, respectively.

6. From the reading of the order, it is evident that the petitioners failed to supply the documents as required by the respondents.

7. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, this Court does not find it appropriate to exercise its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in favour of the petitioners. Hence, both the writ petitions are dismissed.

**(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge**

January 13, 2023

“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No