

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-21945-2014(O&M)

Date of decision : 14.05.2015

V.K.Chaudhary

... Petitioner

Versus

The Haryana Urban Development Authority and another

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. D.R.Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amit Jaiswal, Advocate
for HUDA.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.(ORAL)

This order shall dispose of CWP Nos.21945, 22230, 22240 & 22365 of 2014 as according to learned counsel for the parties, the issue involved therein is identical. For brevity, the facts are being extracted from CWP No.21945 of 2014.

2. The dual prayer in the writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of completion / occupation certificate and that charging of extension fee for non-construction beyond 2009 was uncalled for. Further parity was claimed on the basis of benefit regarding extension fee granted to owner of plot No.1592, Sector 9, Urban Estate, Karnal.

3. Learned counsel for Haryana Urban Development Authority submitted that the authorities had decided the matter and extended the benefit of extension fee as was granted to Plot holder No.1592, Sector 9, Urban Estate,

Karnal. This satisfies the claim of the petitioner so far as charging of extension fee is concerned.

4. In respect of claim for the completion / occupation certificate of plot, it was submitted by learned counsel for the respondents that certain shortcomings are required to be removed before the completion certificate can be issued to the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the shortcomings as may be intimated by the respondents shall be removed and fresh application for occupation certificate shall be furnished. After removing the shortcomings, learned counsel for the petitioner shall approach the authorities for issuance of completion certificate which shall be considered by them in accordance with law. In view of the above, counsel for the petitioner(s) submitted that the writ petitions may be disposed of as such.

6. Ordered accordingly.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

May 14, 2015.
Davinder Kumar