

**IN THE SUPREME APPELLATE COURT GILGIT-BALTISTAN
GILGIT
C. Review. NO. 16/2011 In
SMC. NO.12/2011**

Before:-

**Mr. Justice Rana Muhammad Arshad Khan, Chief Judge.
Mr. Justice Raja Jalal Uddin, Judge.
Mr. Justice Muzaffar Ali, Judge.**

The water and Power Development Authority (WAPDA) through the Project Director,
Sadpara Dam Project, Skardu.

Petitioner

VERSUS

1. Ahlian-e-Sat Para Skardu through their Representatives:-
 - (1) Haji Muhammad Raza s/o Ghulam Hussain,
 - (2) Haji Muhammad Yousaf s/o Haji Qasim,
 - (3) Hamza Ali, s/o Muhammad Hussain,

2. The Provincial Government of Gilgit-Baltistan. Through the Chief Sectary, Gilgit
3. The Deputy Commissioner/Collector District Skardu.
4. Ahliyan-e-New Ranga through their Representatives,
 - (1) Muhammad s/o Ahmad,
 - (2) Nadeem s/o Muhammad Ali,
 - (3) Sher Ali s/o Haji Ismail,
 - (4) Kacho Abbas s/o Kacho Muhammad Ali Khan,
 - (5) Saleem s/o Shakoor Ali,
 - (6) Muhammad Yaqoob s/o Shakoor Ali,All residents of New Ranga, District Skardu.

Respondents

Present:-

Muhammad Shafi Sr, Advocate on behalf of petitioner.
Muhammad Issa Sr. Advocate for respondents alongwith Joher Ali Advocate.
XEN WAPDA.

REVIEW PETITION UNDER AFTICLE 65 OF GILGIT-BALTISTAN
(EMPOWERMENT AND SELF GOVERNANCE) ORDER, 2009. AND
RULE XXVI OF SUPREME APPELLATE COURT RULES 2008 READ
WITH SECTION 114 AND ORDER 47 OF C.P.C AGAINST THE
JUDGMENT ORDER DATED 06-09-2011 PASSED IN SUO MOTU
CASE NO. S.M.C. 12/2011 BY THIS HONORABLE COURT ON THE
PETITION RESPONDENT NO.1 WHEREBY THE PETITIONER HAS
BEEN DIRECTED TO DEPOSIT THE MOUNT OF COMPENSATION
OF LAND WITHIN TWO MONTHS FOR ON WARD PAYMENT TO
THE EFECTEES AND THE PETITIONER WILL ENSURE DEPOSIT
OF THE AMOUNT IN QUESTION AND IN CASE OF FAILURE BY
THE PETITIONER TO DEPOSIT THE AMOUNT THE RESPONDENT
NO.2 WILL PAY THE AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION TO THE
RESPONDENTS NO. 1 AND THE RESPONDENT NO 3 SHALL
PROCEED IN THE MATTER FOR RECOVERY OF AMOUNT ON
COMPENSATION FROM ACQRUING AGENCY AS ARREARS OF
LAND REVENUE IN VIEW OF THE POSITION EXPLAINED BY
THE COLLECTOR AND THE ADVOCATE GENERAL.

FOR REVIEWING OF THE IMPUGUNED JUDGMENT / ORDER
DATED 06.09.2011 OF THIS HONORABLE COURT AND FOR
SETTING ASIDE THE SAME FOR THE ENDS OF JUSTICE AND
EQUITY.

Dated of hearing: - 09-10-2013.

ORDER

Through this petition, the order dated 06.09.2011 passed by this court has been assailed.

The review petition is hopefully barred by time and even otherwise, the review petitioner was not a party to the proceeding in which the order impugned was passed. The application for condonation of delay has been filed but no plausible reason has been given to condone the delay of 57 days. In the present circumstances, no ground for condonation of delay has been made out.

In view of the above, the review petition is dismissed.

Chief Judge

Judge

Judge