



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-32411-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 02.12.2024

Bhagat Singh and another ... Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Ranjit S. Bajaj, Advocate,
for the petitioners.
Mr. Jastej Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.
Mr. Sandeep Khunger, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 & 3.
...

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Petitioners happened to be the owners of land measuring 100 marlas, comprised in specific khasra numbers set out in the petition, situated in the revenue estate of Village Chugithi, G.T. Road Bypass, Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that out of the total landholding of the petitioners, a land measuring 31 marlas (comprised in khasra Nos.29510/9479-9480) was acquired by the Jalandhar Improvement Trust (respondent No.2), for developing a new Colony of 94.5 acres (Guru Gobind Singh Avenue). He submits that the acquisition proceedings were concluded and the award was rendered by the Collector. But, subsequently, the Trust, vide resolution dated August 4, 2006 (P-2), released the subject land, stating that owing to 100 meter non-construction zone, it was not viable for the Trust to utilize the land for the purpose for which it was acquired. He submits that the petitioners never received any compensation either. However, the entries in the record of rights continue to show the respondent-Trust as the owner(s). It is submitted that the landowners, who were identically placed as the petitioners, were issued No Objection Certificate by the Trust on July 10, 2012 (P-4), but the repeated representations submitted by the petitioners with



the respondent-authorities in this regard, have failed to evoke any response. Thus, this petition.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Jastej Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, and Mr. Sandeep Khunger, Advocate, are present in Court on behalf of respondent No.1-State and respondents No.2 & 3-Trust, respectively.

At the outset, learned counsel for respondents No.2 & 3-Trust submits, for the competent authority is already in *seisin* of the concerns/grievances of the petitioners, it would be expedient if the petition is disposed of, at this stage, to enable the respondent(s) to examine the matter in its entirety. And pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law, within a period of 2 weeks from today. Further, he submits that before any such orders are passed, the petitioners through their authorized representatives shall be heard, for which a formal communication would be issued, well in advance.

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 respondent-authorities shall consider the matter in the right earnest, and pass the necessary orders within the time indicated by learned counsel for the respondent(s).

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 petitioners, strictly in accordance with law.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

02.12.2024
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO