

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 7524 of 2015

Date of Decision: 23.4.2015

Barsati Ram

....Petitioner.

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Vishal Garg Narwana, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. In the 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 the respondents to allot the small flat to him under the Rehabilitation Scheme floated by the Chandigarh Administration on 6.11.2006, titled as "Chandigarh Small Flats Scheme, 2006" as he is eligible for the said allotment.

2. The petitioner built a jhugi bearing No. 369, Block E, Industrial Area, Labour Colony No.4, Chandigarh and lived there till the time when the said colony was demolished. The petitioner was issued voter card dated 12.7.2007 (Annexure P-1). The respondents floated a scheme, namely, "The Chandigarh Small Flats Scheme 2006" for rehabilitating the jhugi dwellers. The petitioner had appeared in the concerned office and give his finger impressions in the biometric survey, Annexure P-2. However, the name of the petitioner was missing from

the survey. Accordingly, the petitioner made a representation dated 20.1.2015 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.2, but no response has been received. 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 20.1.2015 (Annexure P-3) 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 decide the representation dated 20.1.2015 (Annexure P-3), 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 23, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE