

Sl. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPMS No.1200 of 2026 <u>Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.</u> Mr. B.M. Pingal, learned counsel for the petitioner. 2. Mr. V.D. Bisen, learned Addl. C.S.C. for the State. 3. Mr. Naresh Pant, learned counsel for respondent no.3, through video conferencing. 4. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the order dated 19.02.2026 as well as order dated 01.04.2026, passed by respondent no.2, annexure nos.11 and 13 to the writ petition, whereby the petitioner was directed to deposit a sum of ₹11,46,666.66/- by a demand draft or cheque in the Office of respondent no.2. 5. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that land of petitioner as well as respondent no.7 who are co-sharer was acquired for construction/widening of the N.H. 94 <i>Muni ki Reti to Agrakhal</i>. Undisputedly on acquisition of the said land the compensation was made to the petitioner as well as respondent no.7. 6. It is further submitted that on the land in-question, a house was also constructed and the compensation for the said house was also paid to the petitioner under the orders of the C.A.L.A. after verifying the documents of entitlement. A complaint was moved by respondent no.7 with regard to the payment of compensation of house to the petitioner on the ground that he does have 1/6th share in the said house, therefore, compensation should also have been given to respondent no.7. After inquiry the complaint was rejected. The respondent no.7 moved an application to the State Human Rights Commission and on the orders passed by the State Human Rights Commission, the order of recovery which is

		impugned in the writ petition has been passed. 7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order which has been passed on the dictates of the State Human Rights Commission is transgressing the jurisdiction of the respondent no.2-C.A.L.A. and therefore such an order should not have been passed by respondent no.2-C.A.L.A. Once the award has been passed, respondent no.2-C.A.L.A. becomes <i>functus officio</i>, therefore, the order impugned could not have been passed by respondent no.2-C.A.L.A. 8. In the opinion of this Court, the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner have some substance, therefore, a counter affidavit is required for final disposal of the writ petition. 9. Issue notice to the respondent no.7 returnable within four weeks. 10. Steps to be taken within three days. 11. List this case on 10.06.2026. 12. Respondent(s) may file counter affidavit(s) within four weeks. 13. In the meantime, effect and operation of the impugned orders dated 19.02.2026 as well as order dated 01.04.2026 shall remain stayed. 14. Interim Relief Application (IA No.1 of 2026) stands disposed of accordingly. (Pankaj Purohit, J.) 06.05.2026 SK
--	--	---