

54735  
REPORTABLE

Status Dismissed

DP No.-

W-10

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

To,

1. The State of Haryana, through its Financial Commissioner & Principal Secretary to Govt. Haryana, Town and Country Planning Department, Mini Secretariat, Sector 17, Chandigarh.
2. Haryana Urban Development Authority, Sector 6, Panchkula, through its Chief Administrator.
3. Estate Officer Haryana Urban Development Authority, Sector 12, Faridabad.

Subject:- CWP No. 3108 of 2015  
R.D. Verma

Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

Respondent(s)

Sir,

In continuation of this Court's order dated 30-3-15 I am directed to forward herewith a copy of Order dated 03.10.2016 passed by this Hon'ble High Court in the above noted Civil Writ Petition for immediate strict compliance.

Given under my hand and the seal of this Court on this 5<sup>th</sup> Day of November 2016.

BY ORDER OF HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sar Joh  
Superintendent (Writ)  
for Assistant Registrar (Writs)



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No. 3108 of 2015

MEMO OF PARTIES

R.D. Verma S/o Sh. Janki Dass Verma Through General Power of Attorney Bir  
Singh Yadav S/o Sh. Fateh Singh Yadav R/o H. No. 1153, Sector -16, Faridabad

.....Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Haryana, through its Financial Commissioner & Principal Secretary to Govt. Haryana, Town & Country Planning Department, Mini Secretariat Sector-17, Chandigarh.
2. Haryana Urban Development Authority, Sector-6, Panchkula, through its Chief Administrator.
3. Estate Officer Haryana Urban Development Authority, Sector-12, Faridabad

.....Respondents

Chandigarh  
Dated: 18.02.2015

  
(VIKAS KUMAR)  
Advocate  
Counsel for the Petitioner

5

86

Civil Writ Petition under article 226/227 of the Constitution of India with the prayer for the issuance of an appropriate Writ, Order or direction especially in the nature of certiorari for quashing the order of resumption dated 26.06.2001 (Annexure P-4) passed by Estate Officer H.U.D.A. Faridabad/Respondent No.3; order dated 04.12.2012 (Annexure P-5) passed by Administrator as appellate Authority and the order dated 21.10.2014 (Annexure P-6) passed by Financial Commissioner & Principal Secretary to Govt. Haryana, Town & Country Planning Department/Respondent No.1, upholding the resumption order

Any other writ order or direction may also kindly be issued which this Hon'ble court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

It is further prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to restrain the respondents from dispossessing the petitioner from the site in question.

**RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:**

1. That the petitioner is resident of Faridabad in the State of Haryana and thus, being citizen of India is competent to invoke the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court under article 226/227 of the constitution of India by filing the instant writ petition.

2. That facts leading to the filing of the instant petition are that kiosk No. 223 Sector -17, Faridabad was allotted to the petitioner by the respondent

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

87

CWP No. 3108 of 2015

DATE OF DECISION : 03.10.2016

R.D. Verma

.... PETITIONER

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

..... RESPONDENTS

CORAM :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, Assistant A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate,  
for respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

\* \* \*

RAMENDRA JAIN, J.

1. The brief facts leading to the filing of this petition are that vide allotment letter dated 22.10.1991 (Annexure P-1), the petitioner was allotted kiosk No. 223, Sector 17, Faridabad, by the Estate Officer, Haryana Urban Development Authority, Faridabad (respondent No.3) for a total sale consideration of ₹ 1,05,000/-. At the fall of hammer, 10% of the sale consideration was deposited by the petitioner. Thereafter, vide receipt dated 22.11.1991, he deposited another sum of ₹ 15,750/- in order to make payment of 25% of the total sale consideration of the said kiosk. As per clause No.5 of the allotment letter, 75% price of the site was to be paid by the petitioner either in lump sum within 60 days from the date of issue of allotment letter without interest, or in 10 half yearly instalments with

88

interest at the rate of 10% per annum. After depositing four instalments till 15.10.1993, the petitioner defaulted in making payments of the remaining instalments. However, construction was raised on the site in question in time. On 10.02.1997, the petitioner gave General Power of Attorney in favour of Shri Bir Singh Yadav. Thereafter, respondent No.3 issued several notices under Section 17 of the Haryana Urban Development Authority Act, 1977 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') to the petitioner, which according to the petitioner were never received by him. Despite that, the petitioner did not make any payment. Resultantly, vide order dated 26.06.2001 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent No.3, the site in question was resumed and 10% of the total sale consideration was forfeited. The appeal and revision filed against the said order were dismissed by the Appellate and the Revisional authorities vide orders dated 04.12.2012 and 21.10.2014 (Annexures P-5 and P-6).

2. The petitioner, through his GPA Shri Bir Singh Yadav, has now filed this petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the aforesaid orders dated 26.06.2001, 04.12.2012 and 21.10.2014.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the site in question was allotted in favour of the petitioner on 22.10.1991 and after making payment of 25% of the total sale price within time, upto 15.10.1993, the petitioner had paid substantial amount, i.e. 60,636/- against the total sale consideration of ₹ 1,05,000/-. He also raised construction on the site in question within time. Thereafter, due to financial constrains and paucity of funds, he could not make payment of balance price. Regarding the notices



89

under Section 17 of the Act, alleged to be issued by respondent No.3 to the petitioner, learned counsel submitted that the petitioner did not receive any such notice. The impugned resumption order was passed by respondent No.3 in the absence of the petitioner. On coming to know about the said resumption order in April, 2012, the petitioner filed appeal against the same. The petitioner is ready and willing to pay the entire dues payable to the respondents along with interest and penalties.

4. During the course of hearing on 28.01.2016, the petitioner was asked to file an affidavit, as to whether or not he had received any papers or proceedings in connection with or relating to the resumption. The said order reads as under :-

*"The order of resumption was passed on 26.06.2001, which was challenged in appeal almost 11 years thereafter in April 2012 and was dismissed on 04.12.2012. The only contention to explain the delay is that the petitioner did not receive any notice of intended resumption or of the resumption order itself. This petition is filed through a general power of attorney. The general power of attorney cannot aver to his knowledge whether or not the notices were served. It is necessary, therefore, that the petitioner himself files an affidavit, as to whether or not he had received any papers or proceedings in connection with or relating to the resumption.*

*Adjourned to 09.03.2016."*

On the last date of hearing, i.e. on 14.09.2016, learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for more time to comply with the aforesaid order dated 28.01.2016. Even today, the said order has not been complied with. Thus,

90

non filing of affidavit by the petitioner himself in terms of the order dated 28.01.2016 would lead to the conclusion that the petitioner was aware of the proceedings in connection with the resumption of the site in question. If that is so, long delay of almost 11 years in challenging the resumption order before the Appellate Authority remains unexplained. Moreover, after 15.10.1993, the petitioner did not make payment of even a single penny towards the remaining sale consideration. The petitioner has been enjoying the possession of the site without making payment of the due instalments and has also raised construction thereon.

5. In view of the above, we do not find any illegality or infirmity in the impugned order dated 26.06.2001 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent No.3, and the orders dated 04.12.2012 and 21.10.2014 (Annexures P-5 and P-6) passed by the Appellate as well as Revisional Authorities upholding the aforesaid resumption order dated 26.06.2001.

6. Petition is, accordingly, dismissed. However, it is made clear that it shall be open to the petitioner to file a representation regarding his claim with the respondents qua refund of money paid by him to the respondents, in accordance with law.

*sd/* (RAMENDRA JAIN)  
JUDGE

October 03, 2016  
ndj

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether Reportable

*sd/* (AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)



*Hasan*  
21/11/16