

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 14711 of 2015

Date of Decision: 23.7.2015

Ajeet Pal Singh

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Mansur Ali, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. The petitioner has invoked the writ jurisdiction of this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India directing the respondents to consider his case for the allotment of a flat and regularization of the same as per the policies, Annexures P-2 to P-7, respectively and in view of judgments of this Court, Annexures P-8 (Colly), being 1984 Sikh riot victim. Further, a direction has been sought to the respondents for taking action on the representation dated 10.2.2015 (Annexure P-12).

2. The petitioner is a 1984 riot victim and Sikh migrant holding Red Card (Annexure P-1). He is living in House No. 1314-B, LIG, Phase X, SAS Nagar, Mohali since 2009. State of Punjab issued a policy dated 3.11.2008 (Annexure P-2) for regularization of possession of the riot victims at the rates so fixed in the year 1991-92 as per policy dated 14.9.2001 (Annexure P-3). The flats are to be allotted at 1991-92 rates as per policy dated 21.10.2008/16.10.2008 (Annexure P-4). The

allotment of flat was based on the policy dated 29.12.2009/4.1.2010 (Annexure P-5). Further, policies dated 29.9.2011 (Annexure P-6) and dated 31.1.2014 (Annexure P-7) were issued by the State of Punjab. Similar CWP No. 16345 of 2009 titled as Kuljit Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another along with other writ petitions was disposed of by this Court vide orders dated 14.9.2010/22.12.2010 (Annexure P-8 Colly). The said order was upheld by this Court in LPA No. 260 of 2011. Similar orders (Annexures P-9 to P-11) were passed by this Court in favour of the riot victims. The petitioner moved a representation dated 10.2.2015 (Annexure P-12) to the respondents for regularization of the possession, 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 moved representation dated 10.2.2015 (Annexure P-12) to the respondents, 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.2 to take a decision on the representation dated 10.2.2015 (Annexure P-12), 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