



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

**112**

**CWP-11818-2024 (O & M)  
Date of Decision: 28.05.2024**

**Astha Infra Developers Private Limited**

....Petitioner

Versus

**State of Haryana and others**

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA**

----

**Present:** Mr. Loveneesh Kanwar, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Tarun Gupta, Advocate  
Mr. Vikas Rathore, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana and  
Mr. Saurabh Mago, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**Sureshwar Thakur, J. (Oral)**

1. The learned counsel for the petitioner has addressed twofold contentions before this Court:

- (i) That a direction be passed upon the respondent concerned,  
to permit the undertakings of excavation activities at the

mining site, given there accruing no environmental hazards to the neighbourhood of the mining site concerned, especially in the wake of a favourable report becoming made in favour of the present petitioner by the Environmental Impact Assessment Committee concerned;

- (ii) That since the mining activities could not be undertaken by the present petitioners owing to certain deterrents and the said non-undertakings of the mining activities at the mineral sites lasted, upto three years.

2. Therefore, the counsel urges that a mandamus be passed upon the respondent concerned to, in the wake of the above, grant a further extensions for undertakings of mining activities at the site concerned.

3. The learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, is, therefore, directed to positively within a period of three weeks from today, consider the legality of both the above prayers, especially the legality of the initially made prayer which *prima facie* the stage appears to be both fair and just.

4. Insofar as the secondary prayer is concerned, a mandamus is passed upon the respondent concerned, to thus in respect thereof also take a stance, which is covered by the relevant rules and instructions.

5. It is further clarified that, the respondent concerned shall neither ask for any extension of time, nor any extension of time shall be accepted by this Court.

6. Disposed of accordingly, with giving liberty to the aggrieved to re-access this Court, but at an appropriate stage.
7. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)  
JUDGE

28.05.2024  
Varinder Prashad

(LALIT BATRA)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No