

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 14675 of 2015

Date of Decision: 23.7.2015

Vipin Arora

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL.
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL.**

PRESENT: Mr. Vinod S. Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. In this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to frame an appropriate policy for protection of rights of subsequent bonafide purchases who have purchased the plot after obtaining necessary approval from the respondents against the proposed cancellation of allotment on the pretext of original allotment being based upon mis-information/concealment at the instance of the original allottee. Further, a writ of certiorari has been sought for setting aside the cancellation proceedings initiated vide show cause notice dated 14.5.2015 (Annexure P-3) proposing to cancel the allotment of residential plot No. 284-GP, measuring 14 marlas situated in Sector 9, Jhajjar.

2. Plot No. 284-GP, Sector 9, Urban Estate Jhajjar, measuring 14 marlas was allotted to Shri Budhram Pahwar son of Shri Siri Ram, on

free hold basis vide allotment letter dated 3.8.2011 (Annexure P-1) for a price consideration of ₹ 32,69,322/-. The allottee after making the requisite amount of 15% of the consideration money and the first installment, sought permission to transfer the plot in question in favour of the petitioner which was accorded vide letter dated 29.3.2013 and the said plot was allotted in favour of the petitioner vide re-allotment letter dated 22.4.2013 (Annexure P-2). A show cause notice dated 14.5.2015 (Annexure P-3) addressed to the original allottee for cancellation of the plot in question was received by the petitioner. The petitioner filed a reply/representation dated 29.5.2015 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.3, but no response has been received till date. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that for the relief claimed in the writ petition, the petitioner has sent reply/representation dated 29.5.2015 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.3, but no action has so far been taken thereon.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, perusing the present petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we dispose of the present petition by directing respondent No.3 to take a decision on the reply/representation dated 29.5.2015 (Annexure P-4), in accordance with law by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

July 23, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE