

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 9790 of 2015

Date of Decision: 18.5.2015

Ganga Ram

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Ram Avtar Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. Through 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 consider his claim for the allotment of plot measuring 500 square yards in the oustees category in Sectors 12, 20-A and 20-B, Faridabad or its adjoining sectors.

2. The petitioner is owner of the land measuring 48 kanal 12 marlas having 1/6th share situated within the revenue estate of village Ajronda, Tehsil and District Faridabad. The land was acquired by the State of Haryana for the development and utilization of land as residential, commercial and institutional area, Sectors 12, 20-A and 20-B, Faridabad vide award dated 29.6.1998. As per the policies of the Haryana Urban Development Authority (HUDA) dated 18.3.1992 and 26.9.1994, the petitioner was entitled to a plot of 500 square yards in the

developed Sectors 12, 20-A and 20-B or the adjoining sectors in the revenue estate of village Ajronda or its surroundings in the urban estate, Faridabad set up by the HUDA. Since no plot was allotted to the petitioner, he made a representation dated 20.1.2015 (Annexure P-2) to respondents No.2 to 4 for allotment of a residential plot out of oustee quota in urban estate, Faridabad, but no response has been received till date. 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-2) to respondents No.2 to 4, 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.4 to take a decision on the representation dated 20.1.2015 (Annexure P-2), 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

May 18, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE