

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.6558 of 2015

Date of Decision:- 08.04.2015.

Ajay Atri

.....Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Urban Development Authority and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

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?

Present: Ms. Sheenu Sura, Advocate for the petitioner.

SURYA KANT, J. (ORAL)

The grievance of the petitioner in the instant writ petition is against the demand notice seeking payment of additional price towards the residential plot No.651, Sector 51, Urban Estate Gurgaon which has been re-allotted to him.

The petitioner has taken various grounds in the representation dated 21.08.2014 (Annexure P-6) to contend that the additional demand is not maintainable. It is also his case that the impugned notice runs contrary to the decisions of this Court dated 23.11.2012 and 30.01.2013 passed in CWP Nos.10718 of 2012 and CWP Nos.1939 of 2013 (Annexures P-8 and P-9 respectively).

Since the determination of factual and legal issues raised by the petitioner vide above mentioned representation dated 21.08.2014 would require scrutiny of record by the Authorities, we dispose of this writ petition at this stage, without expressing any views on merits with a direction to the respondents to call for the record and decide the petitioner's representation in the light of the cited decisions, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

**(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE**

**(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE**

April 08, 2015.

sandeep sethi