

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.17144 of 2015
Date of Decision: 27.08.2015

Jai Bhagwan

. . . .Petitioner

Versus

Chairman the Permanent Lok Adalat and Public Utility Services,
Karnal and others

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: Mr.Nonish Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J.

This petition is filed to challenge order dated 21.5.2015 passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat under Section 22C of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 (for short 'the Act').

In brief, the petitioner has allegedly purchased one residential plot No.C-4-01, Block No.C4, measuring 251 sq. yards against a consideration of ₹28,42,175/- in Soni Palm City, a residential colony developed by respondents No.2 & 3 in Sector 32 and 32A, Karnal.

There is no dispute that the petitioner had failed to make the payment of the installments as per the demand plan Ex. R2, he did not respond to the demand letters and reminders Exs.R6 to Ex.R11, Ex.R13 & Ex.R15 and allotment of the plot in his favour was cancelled vide letter dated 1.4.2013 Ex.R-5. The Permanent

Lok Adalat has decided that the petitioner would not be entitled to interest on the amount deposited by him because he was irregular in depositing the installments within the stipulated time and even once his allotment was cancelled.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has basically argued that the respondents have changed the plan as earlier there was a plot in front of his plot but now they have put up transformer, therefore, the respondents were not justified in demanding the preferential location charges.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and after considering his arguments and record, am of the considered opinion that as per buyer's agreement Ex.R-4, the petitioner has been allotted the same plot which was booked by him and he cannot control the respondents to use the other property owned by it as per his choice.

In view thereof, I do not find any merit in the present petition and the same is thus hereby dismissed.

27.08.2015*Vivek***(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE**