

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

112

**Civil Writ Petition No.7854 of 2018
Date of decision: March 28, 2018**

Nirbhaya Singh and othersPetitioners
versus
State of Haryana and othersRespondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Parmod Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners have approached this Court by way of instant writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent-Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board, Panchkula, to refund the amount deposited by them as 25% of the total allotment price, besides the amount of first installment deposited by each of them on 19.08.2013 (as contained in **Annexure P-4**), along with interest @ 18% on the said amount, *inter alia*, on the ground that the possession of the shops allotted to them by the respondent-Board was not delivered till December 2015, whereas the allotment letters were issued on 22.06.2009 (**Annexure P-2**).

2. After arguing for sometime, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that he may be allowed to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation collectively before the Chief Administrator, Haryana State

Agricultural Marketing Board, Panchkula-respondent No.2, along with all the supporting material, to substantiate their claim as made in this writ petition. It was further prayed that a time bound direction be issued to the said authority to decide the same after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners and by passing a speaking order in accordance with law.

3. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, perusing the present writ petition and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn by granting liberty to the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation collectively appending all the necessary and relevant documents to support their claim before respondent No.2 within one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, such a representation is filed, the same shall be decided by the said authority by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners within next three months in accordance with law.

**(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE**

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE**

March 28, 2018
sonia gugnani

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable? | Yes/No |