



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-14203-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 31.05.2024

Ram Chander
... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana and others
... Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Ms. Aakriti Mittal, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. AG, Haryana,
Mr. Karan Jindal, Asstt. AG, Haryana and
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has prayed for the following substantive relief:

“Civil writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus or any other writ, order or direction, directing the Respondents to decide the representation dated 09.06.2023 and 09.08.2023 submitted by the Petitioner (Annexure P-5 & Annexure P-6) and to provide the outstanding dues in comply with the Judgment/order dated 28.03.2023 passed by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana, Town and Country Planning Department, Chandigarh in Revision Petition no. 151 of 2022 titled "*Ram Chander vs. The Administrator, Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran and Anr.*" (Annexure P-4), in the interest of justice and equity;

AND



It is further prayed that this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order and direction thereby seeking directions to the Respondents to not to sell/dispose off the disputed plot in favor of any third party during the pendency of the instant writ petition, in the interest of justice.”

At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that prior to the institution of this petition, the petitioner had even served the respondent-authorities with the representations dated 09.06.2023 (P-5) & 09.08.2023 (P-6). However, even though a considerable time has elapsed, the matter has not made any tangible progress. Thus, interest/rights of the petitioner continues to suffer.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Ankur Mittal, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, is present in Court on behalf of the respondents. At the outset, he submits that as the respondent-authorities are already in *seisin* of the representations (*ibid*) alleged to have been submitted by the petitioner, it shall be expedient if this petition is disposed of, at this stage, to enable the competent authority to consider the concerns/grievances of the petitioner. And pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law. He submits that before any such orders are passed, the petitioners shall be heard, for which a formal communication will be issued well in advance.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is agreeable to the course suggested by learned State counsel. However, she submits that the matter being time sensitive, the respondent-authorities be directed to take a decision within a specified time.

In response, learned State counsel submits that a formal order, after affording an adequate opportunity to the petitioner, shall be passed within a period of 4 weeks from today.

In the wake of the position sketched out above, and in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties, the petition stands disposed of.



This Court is sanguine that the competent authority shall consider the matter in the right earnest, and pass the necessary orders in accordance with law.

Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion on the merits of the case of either party, for, as indicated above, the competent authority shall examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

31.05.2024
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO