



2025:UHC:2809

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR VERMA

21ST APRIL, 2025

WRIT PETITION NO.1068 OF 2025 (M/S)

Yaseen

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Uttarakhand and Others

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner : Mr. Mohd. Safdar,
Advocate.

Counsel for the Respondent : Mr. N.S. Pundir,
Nos. 1 to 4 Deputy Advocate General.

Counsel for the Respondent : Mr. Ashutosh Thakral,
No. 5 Advocate (through video
conferencing).

Hon'ble Alok Kumar Verma,J.

The present writ petition has been filed under
Article 226 of the Constitution of India with the
following prayers :-

“(I) To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondent no. 1, 2 and 3 not to raise the construction over the ceiling land in question.

(II) To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondent no. 2 and 3 to decide the representation dated 25.03.2025. (Annexure No.4) to this writ petition).

(III) To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus to the Respondent No. 1, 2 and 3 to maintain a status quo with regard to the establishment in question till the final disposal of the present case.

(IV) To issue any other writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in view of the facts and circumstances of the case.



(V) To awarded in favor of the petitioner and against the respondents. ”

2. Heard Mr. Mohd. Safdar, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. N.S. Pundir, learned Deputy Advocate General for the respondent nos. 1 to 4 and Mr. Ashutosh Thakral, learned counsel for the respondent no.5.

3. Mr. Mohd. Safdar, Advocate, submitted that the respondent nos. 1 to 3 are raising a construction over a ceiling land without adopting due process of law. A representation dated 25.03.2025 was sent by the petitioner to the District Magistrate, Haridwar, the respondent no.2. The said representation is still pending.

4. Mr. Mohd. Safdar, Advocate, has requested to decide the present writ petition directing the respondent no.2 to decide the said representation as expeditiously as possible.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents have not opposed the said submission.

6. Mr. N.S. Pundir, Deputy Advocate General, has sought four weeks' time for deciding the said representation.

7. With the consent of both the parties, the present Writ Petition (WPMS No. 1068 of 2025) is



2025:UHC:2809

disposed of directing the District Magistrate, Haridwar, the respondent no.2, to decide the said representation dated 25.03.2025 (annexure no.4 to the writ petition) as expeditiously as possible but not later than four weeks from the date of production of certified copy of this order.

8. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merit of the case.

ALOK KUMAR VERMA, J.

Dt: 21.04.2025
Shiv/