

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

DATE OF DECISION: MAY 14, 2015

Ramu

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

Chandigarh Administration, Chandigarh and others

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

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

Present: Ms. Ekta Thakur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

It is the contention of counsel for the petitioner that the claim of the petitioner has been rejected by the Permanent Lok Adalat proceeding on the assumption that there is no biometrics survey conducted, where he can be shown to be residing in the hutment. She has referred to document, Annexure P-2, which is an application as submitted by the petitioner himself, whereas the Permanent Lok Adalat has stated that the application was submitted by his father. Reference has also been made to Annexure P-3, which depicts that the petitioner had participated in the biometrics survey conducted by the respondents and was allotted Serial Number 02162, Labour Colony.

In the light of these two documents, it is apparent that the petitioner should first approach the Permanent Lok Adalat by filing a review

application so that the correct facts are brought to the its notice for appropriate decision. This order is being passed in the light of the judgement passed by this Court in Civil Writ Petition No.3552 of 2015 (Estate Officer, U.T., Chandigarh Vs. Charan Kaur and another), decided on 27.02.2015, where it has been held that review petition is maintainable in the light of the provisions as contained in Section 22D of the Legal Services Authority Act.

With the above observations, the petition stands disposed of.

May 14, 2015
khurmi

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE