

ITEM NO.105
ION IV

COURT NO.7

SECT

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

I N D I A

Civil Appeal

No(s).

2275/2007

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION & ORS.
llant(s)

Appe

VERSUS

RAJ KUMAR & ORS.
ondent(s)

Resp

(With office report)

Date : 09/10/2014 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPAK MISRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHINTON FALI NARIMAN

For Appellant(s) Ms. Kaveeta Wadia, Adv.
Mr. Shashank Tripathi, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. M. C. Dhingra, Adv.
Mr. Manpreet Singh Doabia, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the
revisional authority had only granted liberty
to the respondent to avail the remedy of re-transfer of the site
before the Estate Officer, as a consequence of which he
was required to pay conversion charges and
get it re-transferred, but the High Court has placed reliance
upon a Notification issued on 24.02.2006 issued by the
Finance Secretary, Chandigarh Administration,
which is

Signature Not Verified

prospective in nature and thereby an error has crept in.

Digitally signed by
Naveen Kumar
Date: 2014.10.10

16:17:32 IST
Reason:

mises in

It is urged by the learned counsel for the appellant

that the said Notification could not have been pressed
into service, for the allotment of the pre
question was cancelled some time in year 1990.

We find,

2

prima facie, substantial force in the aforesaid submission
of the learned counsel for the appellant.

Mr. Dhingra, learned counsel for the respondent prays
for some time to argue the matter.

Call on 15.10.2014.

(NAVEEN KUMAR)
COURT MASTER

(TAPAN KUMAR CHAKRABORTY)
COURT MASTER

1

ITEM NO.105
SECTION IV

COURT NO.7

SECTION IV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

I N D I A

Civil Appeal

No(s).

2275/2007

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION & ORS.
Appellant(s)

Appellant

VERSUS

RAJ KUMAR & ORS.
Respondent(s)

Respondent

(With office report)

Date : 09/10/2014 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPAK MISRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHINTON FALI NARIMAN

For Appellant(s) Ms. Kaveeta Wadia, Adv.
Mr. Shashank Tripathi, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. M. C. Dhingra, Adv.
Mr. Manpreet Singh Doabia, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the
revisional authority had only granted liberty
to the respondent to avail the remedy of re-transfer of the site
before the Estate Officer, as a consequence of which he
get it was required to pay conversion charges and
re-transferred, but the High Court has placed reliance
upon a Notification issued on 24.02.2006 issued by the
Finance Secretary, Chandigarh Administration,
which is

Signature Not Verified

prospective in nature and thereby an error has crept in.

Digitally signed by
Naveen Kumar
Date: 2014.10.10

16:17:32 IST
Reason:

arises in

It is urged by the learned counsel for the appellant
that the said Notification could not have been pressed
into service, for the allotment of the pre
question was cancelled some time in year 1990.

We find,

prima facie, substantial force in the aforesaid submission of the learned counsel for the appellant.

Mr. Dhingra, learned counsel for the respondent prays for some time to argue the matter.

Call on 15.10.2014.

(NAVEEN KUMAR)
COURT MASTER

(TAPAN KUMAR CHAKRABORTY)
COURT MASTER