

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.2752 of 2016  
Date of Decision: February 11, 2016

Manoj Kumar

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM:** HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.  
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH.

---

Present: Mr.Narender Pal, Advocate, for  
Mr.Abhishek Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
Ms.Kirti Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

-. -

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?*

---

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1&2 only at  
this stage.

On our asking, Ms.Kirti Singh, learned Deputy  
Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on their behalf.

Let two copies of the writ petition be supplied to  
the State counsel during the course of day failing which this  
order shall be automatically recalled and the writ petition shall  
be deemed to have been dismissed for non-prosecution.

In view of the nature of order which we propose to  
pass, it is not necessary to seek any counter-reply from  
respondent Nos.1&2 or to serve respondent No.3 at this stage  
as no order prejudicial to its interest is being passed.

The petitioner is a resident of village Chuklana,  
Block Samlakha, District Panipat. He claims himself to be living

Below the Poverty Line (BPL) to whom the Gram Panchayat decided to allot plots of 100 square yards. The grievance of the petitioner is that though he is fully eligible for such allotment under the 'Mahatma Gandhi Gramin Basti Yojna' which the State Government decided to implement vide Policy memo dated 01.02.2008 (P-1) but the respondents are not considering his claim for undisclosed reasons. It is alleged that the respondents have allotted plots to ineligible persons who are not entitled to such allotment. It further appears from the averments that an exercise to identify the eligible persons was undertaken and the petitioner was included in such list but no follow up action has been taken by the Deputy Commissioner, Panipat or the Gram Panchayat.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner has placed reliance on a Government Policy which, according to him, has not been given effect, we dispose of this writ petition, without expressing any views on the merits, with a direction to respondent No.2 to verify the claim of the petitioner as contained in this petition and take an appropriate decision in accordance with law, within a period of four months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order.

Ordered accordingly.

Dasti.

[SURYA KANT]  
JUDGE

*February 11, 2016*  
*mohinder*

[RAJ MOHAN SINGH]  
JUDGE