

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

**CWP- 6013 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 21.05.2015**

Satish Kumar

..... Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana & ors.

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. S.S.Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Ashok Singh Chaudhary, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Ajay Tewari, J.(Oral)

By this petition the petitioner has challenged the order passed by the respondents whereby application for mutual change of Type-II Government House of the petitioner was rejected.

The petitioner is living on the first floor of H.No.1348-A, Type-II, Sector 39-B, Chandigarh. Another employee, Raghubir Singh was allotted H.No.1348, Type-II, Sector 39-B, Chandigarh. As per the House Allotment Policy, the Government employees who are residing in the same category of houses can mutually exchange their house/s provided atleast one year is left for the retirement of either of them. Raghubir Singh aforementioned was to retire on 31.01.2015. On 20.01.2014 the petitioner and Raghubir Singh moved an application for mutual exchange of the houses in terms of the policy. However the application was decided in March and since at that time less than one year remained for the retirement of Raghubir Singh

the prayer was declined.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that though the delay in processing the application is the fault of the respondents yet even if now the respondents are willing to sympathetically consider the claim of the petitioner for the aforesaid house No.1348-A, Type-II, Sector 39-B, Chandigarh he would be satisfied.

Learned Additional Advocate General has stated that seeing the nature of the controversy and the fact that the petitioner is only seeking a house to which he is otherwise entitled, he would personally intervene in the matter of exchange and ensure that on its vacation H.No.1348, Type-II, Sector 39-B, Chandigarh would be allotted to him as a special case.

No other argument has been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

In the circumstances the petition is disposed of.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

May 21, 2015
Sanjiv/Pooja Sharma-I