

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 6433 of 2015

Date of Decision: 7.4.2015

Balmukand

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Dr. Surya Parkash, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. By way of instant 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 respondents No.2 and 3 to issue allotment letter to him for allotment of plot No. 444, Sector 18, Rewari measuring 14 marlas as he was declared successful in the draw of lots vide letter dated 23.10.2010 (Annexure P-1) issued by respondent No.3.

2. In the year 2010, the Haryana Urban Development Authority, Panchkula, floated a scheme for allotment of residential plots of various sizes in various Districts of Haryana through draw of lots. Some plots were kept reserved for defence personnel/ex-servicemen and various other categories. The petitioner being ex-serviceman applied by way of application form dated 20.3.2010 (Annexure P-1) for a residential plot of 14 marlas in Sector 18, Rewari under defence quota by depositing an

earnest money of ₹ 2,34,100/- vide receipt dated 23.3.2010 (Annexure P-2). In the draw of lots, the petitioner was declared successful and was allotted a plot of 14 marlas under defence quota vide letter dated 23.10.2010 (Annexure P-3). Respondent No.3 vide letter dated 24.2.2011 (Annexure P-4) requested the petitioner to submit certain documents which he did within the stipulated period. Despite submitting the documents as required by respondent No.3, allotment letter was not issued to the petitioner. The petitioner submitted various representations to the respondents including representation dated 3.2.2015 (Annexure P-7) to respondent No.2 but to no avail. 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 3.2.2015 (Annexure P-7) to respondent No.2, 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 3.2.2015 (Annexure P-7), 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

April 7, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE