

CWP-32046-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-32046-2024Date of decision: 28.11.2024

Dev Inder Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Malkeet Singh Balianwali, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner (Dev Inder Singh) has prayed for the following substantive relief:-

“Civil Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ, order, or direction, especially in the nature of Mandamus, directing the respondents not to go ahead with undergoing construction of Road, as described in the Site Plan (Annexure P-2) with blue crisscross pattern, on the private land of the petitioners without acquisition of any part of the land of the petitioner by paying compensation for the land acquired; and the respondents be further directed to restore possession of the private land of petitioner encroached upon illegally;

AND

To issue writ, order, or directing, especially in the nature of Mandamus, directing the respondents to pay compensation for the demolition of constructed structures,



CWP-32046-2024

boundary, and for uprooting of 15 numbers of Mango Trees of age 4 years, and crop of the petitioner;

AND

To issue and order or direction directing the respondents No.1 and 2 to initiate action against the erring officials, particularly, respondent No.4, for encroachment upon private land of the petitioner illegally in violation of provisions of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, and Article 300-A of the Constitution of India.

AND

To pass an order of stay to restrain the respondents from further carrying out civil work for completion of 21 feet road on unacquired land of the petitioner, illegally encroached by the respondents without resorting to acquisition proceedings and paying compensation for the same till the final decision of the present Civil Writ Petition”

Having argued the matter at some length, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, for the present, he be permitted to withdraw the petition to enable the petitioner to pursue the representation dated 29.10.2024 (P-3), the respondent authorities have been served with, in the first instance. As also, to avail such other remedies, as shall be admissible in law.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

28.11.2024
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No