



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

CWP No.29465 of 2019

Date of Decision: 01.08.2025

Makhan Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present:- None for petitioners.

Mr. R.S. Pandher, Addl. A.G., Punjab
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

LISA GILL, J.(Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ-petition is for issuance of direction to respondent No.3-Gram Panchayat, Khanpur to stop mining from the land of petitioner as well as adjoining land.

2. Reply on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 was filed in February, 2024. It is specifically stated therein that mining site had been surrendered by the Contractor. Surrender application has also been attached along-with the reply as Annexure R-7 and as per report dated 11.05.2018 (Annexure R-5) of the Mining Officer, no illegal mining was being carried out in or in the vicinity of khasra numbers in question and that site in question has been surrendered. It is reiterated that no illegal mining is being carried out at the site in question.



3. Reply on behalf of respondent No.3-Gram Panchayat has also been filed. Learned counsel for respondent No.3 reiterates that no mining, leave alone illegal mining is being carried out in the area in question. Gram Panchayat, in any case, had not leased out the land in question for mining.

4. None had appeared on behalf of petitioners on the last date of hearing. Order dated 22.07.2025 reads as under:-

“ Learned counsel for respondent No.3 submits that no cause of action survives to the petitioners as the auction vide which land in question was allocated for mining by the Department, stands cancelled.

None appears on behalf of the petitioners.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 01.08.2025.

Learned counsel for the petitioner be notified of the date fixed.”

5. Today again, there is no representation on behalf of petitioners despite learned counsel for petitioners being notified of the date fixed.

6. In view of specific stand of the respondents, which has not been controverted, we do not find any justification for continuance of proceedings in present writ-petition.

7. Writ-petition is, accordingly, disposed of as infructuous.

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

01.08.2025
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No