

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 18676 of 2016

Date of Decision: 8.9.2016

Surjit Singh and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL.
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN.**

PRESENT: Mr. Mansur Ali, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. The petitioners have invoked the writ jurisdiction of this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India directing the respondents to allot the flats to them in view of the policies, Annexures P-2 to P-10, respectively and in view of judgments of this Court, Annexures P-12 (Colly), being 1984 Sikh riot victims. Further, a direction has been sought to the respondents for taking action on the representation dated 4.7.2016 (Annexure P-11).

2. The petitioners are 1984 riot victims and Sikh migrants holding Red Cards. State of Punjab issued a policy dated 3.11.2008 (Annexure P-2) for regularization of possession of the riot victims at the rates so fixed in the year 1991-92 as per policy dated 14.9.2001 (Annexure P-3). The flats are to

be allotted at 1991-92 rates as per policy dated 21.10.2008/16.10.2008 (Annexure P-4). The allotment of flat was based on the policy dated 29.12.2009/4.1.2010 (Annexure P-5). Further, policies dated 29.9.2011 (Annexure P-6), dated 31.1.2014 (Annexure P-7), dated 15.5.2015/22.4.2015 (Annexure P-8) and dated 9.3.2016 (Annexure P-9) were issued by the State of Punjab. The State of Punjab had taken a decision on 23.10.2015/22.4.2015/14.9.2015 (Annexure P-10) to allot 22 flats to the riot victims within 30 days. Petitioners No.1 to 13 were part of the list of 22 persons for the allotment of flats, but no flat has been allotted to them. Accordingly, the petitioners moved a representation dated 4.7.2016 (Annexure P-11) to the respondents for the allotment of flats, but no response has been received till date. The Similar CWP No. 16345 of 2009 titled as Kuljit Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another along with other writ petitions was disposed of by this Court vide orders dated 14.9.2010/8.4.2011/3.8.2012/4.10.2012 (Annexure P-12 Colly). The said orders were upheld by this Court in LPA No. 260 of 2011. 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 4.7.2016 (Annexure P-11) to the respondents, 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 4.7.2016 (Annexure P-11), in

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

September 8, 2016
gbs

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No