



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No. 23752 of 2024

Date of decision: 24.09.2024

Honey Builders Limited and others

.... Petitioners

Vs.

Director, Town & Country Planning, Haryana and others

.... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Akshay Bhan, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Amandeep Singh Talwar, Advocate and
Mr. Shaurya Khanna, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana with
Mr. Karan Jindal, Asstt. Advocate General, Haryana and
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

ARUN PALLI, J (Oral)

On September 18,2024, this Court had passed the following
order:

“Learned Senior counsel for the petitioners submits that, in essence, the limited grievance that the petitioners have is: the representation dated 16.07.2024 (P-1), the Director, Department of Town and Country Planning, Haryana (respondent No.1), has been served with, contains every possible concerns/grievances, as are also set out in the petition, but the same remains unaddressed.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Ankur Mittal, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, for respondents No.1 and 2, is present in Court. At the outset, he prays for a short accommodation to seek instructions as



also to furnish a specific affidavit to respond to the dispute, as sought to be raked up by the petitioners.

May do so, a day prior to the adjourned date, with an advance copy to the counsel for the petitioner.

Adjourned to 24.09.2024.”

Today, in response to the order referred to above, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, on instructions, submits that considering the issues that are sought to be raised in the petition, it would rather be expedient, if the petition is disposed of, at this stage, to enable the competent authority (Director, Town & Country Planning, Haryana), to decide the representation dated July 16, 2024 (P-1), the department has been served with, in the first instance. He submits that before any formal order is passed on the said representation, the petitioners as also the other stake holders, if any, shall be heard. And, the petitioner would be served with a formal communication, notifying the date, time and venue, well in advance.

That being so, learned Senior counsel for the petitioners submits that let the petition be disposed of in terms of the statement made by the learned State counsel. However, it is urged that the matter being time sensitive, the authorities be directed to consider and decide the same within a specified time.

To this, learned State counsel submits that the necessary orders, in accordance with law, shall be passed within eight 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, this petition is accordingly disposed of.



This Court is sanguine that the authority shall consider/examine the matter in the right earnest, and pass appropriate orders within the time indicated by learned State counsel, assigning reasons in support thereof.

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

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

24.09.2024
deepak

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