

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 18683 of 2014

Date of Decision: 17.7.2015

Rajinder Singh @ Gajinder Singh

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. A.S. Gulati, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Bhardwaj, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. G.S. Attariwala, Advocate for respondent No.2.

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 consider his case for allotment of plot under the concerned scheme.

2. The petitioner is a LDP of Truck Stand Scheme, Amritsar (in short "the Scheme") circulated by the Improvement Trust, Amritsar. The petitioner is owner of khasra numbers as mentioned in para 2 of the writ petition prior to the notification of the Scheme. In the year 1980, respondent No.2 had acquired the land of the petitioner for the Scheme with a offer of allotment of plot to the petitioner somewhere else subject to his depositing ₹ 500/-. The petitioner did so vide receipt dated 28.10.1980 (Annexure P-1) and had applied for allotment of a plot under

the Scheme. The respondents sent a letter dated 30.9.1993 (Annexure P-2) to the petitioner for producing some documents. In pursuance thereto, the petitioner approached the respondents along with required documents. Since no action was taken in the matter, the petitioner moved a representation dated 21.11.2006 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.2 for the allotment of a plot, but to no effect. Thereafter, the petitioner again made a representation dated 14.1.2013 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.2, 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 a representation dated 14.1.2013 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.2, but no action has so far been taken thereon.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, 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 14.1.2013 (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 17, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE