

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 5939 of 2013

Date of decision: 19.3.2013

M/s Shergill Enterprises

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.P. NAGRATH**

PRESENT: Mr. Ashwani Chopra, Senior Advocate with
Mr. A.S. Sullar, Advocate for the petitioner.

SURYA KANT, J. (ORAL)

Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 4 only.

Ms. Munisha Gandhi, Addl. AG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4.

In view of the nature of order which we propose to pass, there is no necessity to file reply on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4.

The petitioner is aggrieved by the revision and consequential enhancement of conversion charges from ₹ 20 lacs to ₹ 130 lacs per acre for the regularization/approval to set up a 'marriage palace'. One of the contention raised by the petitioner is that the State Government has since vide a new policy decision taken pursuant to the public notice dated 13.11.2012 (Annexure P-11), substantially reduced the regularization

charges of existing un-authorized marriage palaces situated outside the Municipal limits, there is no rhyme or reason to discriminate in this regard vis-a-vis the marriage palaces located within such limits. The petitioner is said to have submitted a representation, with copies to various authorities on 12.2.2013, seeking the benefit of the above-stated policy but is still awaiting response thereto.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and considering the above-noticed contention regarding applicability/expansion of the Policy decision dated November 13, 2012, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the instant writ petition at this stage without expressing any views on merits, with a direction to respondents No. 1 to 4 to treat this petition as a supplementary representation on behalf of the petitioner and dispose of the same by passing a speaking order in accordance with law/policy within a period of three months. It shall be appreciated if the petitioner is granted an opportunity of personal hearing by the Competent Authority. The petitioner shall continue to deposit the due installments but without prejudice to the order that may be passed by the Competent Authority.

Dasti.

**(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE**

March 19, 2013
rishu

**(R.P. NAGRATH)
JUDGE**