



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

125

CWP-13699-2025

Date of Decision: 22.05.2025

ANUJA SINGHAL AND ANOTHER

.....PETITIONERS

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE LAPITA BANERJI**

Present:- Mr. Vikram Singh Punia, Advocate
Ms. Yashasvi Rana, Advocate and
Mr. Amit Siwach, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. A.G., Haryana with
Mr. Saurabh Mago, DAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that at this stage, he restricts his claim to the issuance of a direction to respondent No.5 to expeditiously decide the petitioner's appeal (Annexure P-23) or at least the prayer for stay filed by the petitioners along with their aforesaid appeal filed under Section 20 of the Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran Act, 1977 (For short 1977 Act) to challenge therein the order/notice dated 25.04.2025 passed by the Estate Officer, HSVP, Sonipat.

2. Learned State counsel has no objection to the acceptance of afore alternative prayer made on behalf of the petitioners.

3. The afore alternative prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners is found to be reasonable. The learned State counsel has also no objection to its acceptance. Even otherwise a direction to expeditiously



decide a *lis* between the parties prejudice none. Rather, an early decision benefits both the parties to the *lis*.

4. In the light of above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.5 to take decision, preferably within one month, on the statutory appeal filed by the petitioners to challenge therein the order/notice dated 25.04.2025 passed by the Estate Officer, HSVP, Sonipat but only after affording adequate opportunity of hearing to all concerned, in accordance with law.

5. Needless to say that in case, the decision taken by respondent No.5 on the petitioners' aforesaid appeal is prejudicial to the interest of the petitioners, they would be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

6. It is further clarified that by issuing the afore directions, we are not commenting on the merits of the appeal filed by the petitioners or on the maintainability/entertainability of their claim made by them through their appeal.

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

[LAPITA BANERJI]
JUDGE

22.05.2025

Prince

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No