



CWP-22642-2024

-1-

133

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-22642-2024
Date of Decision: 09.09.2024

Naveen KumarPetitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present : Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARSH BUNGER, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India *inter alia* seeking a writ in the nature of Mandamus for directing the respondents to make necessary arrangements for drainage of dirty water in the Village Singhpura so that no loss is caused to the crops of the petitioner and other small farmers.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as regards the grievance raised in the instant petition, the petitioner has already submitted various representations to the District Authorities including representation dated 30.07.2024 (Annexure P-5) submitted to the learned Deputy Commissioner, Jind, which is pending consideration before him.

2.1 Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner would be satisfied, if appropriate directions are issued to respondent No.2 (Deputy Commissioner, Jind) to decide the representation dated 30.07.2024

**CWP-22642-2024****-2-**

(Annexure P-5) submitted by the petitioner in a time bound manner.

3. At this stage, Mr. Subhash Rana, Advocate appears and files his *Vakalatnama* on behalf of respondent No.6 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions and submits that in fact it is the petitioner who has encroached upon the drainage by raising some construction thereon.

4. Mr. Rajneesh Chadwal, AAG, Haryana, who has appeared on behalf of respondent/State in this case, pursuant to the advance copy of petition having been sent to the State, submits that in case, any such representation is received in the office of respondent No.2 (Deputy Commissioner, Jind), the same would be considered and decided at the earliest by passing a well reasoned order, after affording due opportunities of hearing to the petitioner as well as respondent No.6 herein, within a period of two months from today.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for respondent No.6 do not raise any objection to the aforesaid course of action.

6. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not press the instant petition any further.

7. In view of the aforesaid submissions made by the respective counsel, the petition is disposed of, accordingly.

8. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.

09.09.2024*Himani***(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No