

2024:PHHC:171683

125 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARHCOCP-3390-2024 (O&M)
Decided on:-20.12.2024

Ajeet Kumar Dawar

....Petitioner..

VS.

Arun Kumar Gupta (IAS), Additional Chief Secretary to
Govt.of Haryana, Department of Industries and Commerce,
Haryana Civil Secretariat and others

...Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJAPresent: Ms. Varsha Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate and
Mr. Siddhanth Arora, Advocate,
for the respondents.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the respondents has handed over a communication dated 19.12.2024 to the learned counsel representing the petitioner. A copy thereof is taken on record. For reference relevant para No. 1 of the said communication is extracted hereunder:-

“That the petitioner filed objections U/s 5A which were examined by DRO-cum-LAC, Karnal and forwarded with the recommendation that Punjab Agro Sales India, industrial unit is constructed on Khasra No.9218 (1-7) and 9220 (1-13) total 3-0 which is running since long as industry. This unit has also taken license from small scale industry and taken number of NOCs from the concerned departments except CLU and recommended to release this land from acquisition.

Accordingly, decision may be taken to release the land U/s 48

for Land Acquisition Act, 1894 in tune with affidavit filed by Under Secretary I&C, Haryana for the land measuring 0 Bigha-19 Biswa in Khasra No.9218 under existing industry (excluding the land falling under 50 mtr. wide green belt along NH). The draft notification U/s 48 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 duly signed by DRO-cum-LAC, Karnal is enclosed herewith.”

2. Learned counsel for the respondents, on instructions from Mr. Manish Lohan (HCS), Additional Director (Industries & Commerce Department), submits that a notification under Section 48 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, shall be issued with respect to the aforementioned land within a period of 06 weeks from today.
3. In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner does not want to press the present petition.
4. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed being not pressed. Rule stands discharged.
5. However, in case the needful is not done within the afore-stated period, as per undertaking, the petitioner would be at liberty to seek revival of the present contempt petition and in that eventuality, the erring concerned officer(s) would be liable to pay additional sum of Rs.50,000/- as costs from his/her own pocket in favour of the petitioner towards litigation expenses, immediately, i.e. on the first date of listing of revival application.

20.12.2024
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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