

\$~30-34

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 500/2015**

NIRMALA RANI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Hemant Singh, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr.Jayendra, Advocate for R-1.

Mr.Rakesh Mittal, Advocate for R-2/DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 5644/2015**

BALDEV RAJ

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Hemant Singh, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr.Satyakam, ASC for GNCTD.

Ms.Manika Tripathy, Advocate for DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 3851/2015**

PURSHOTAM LAL

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Hemant Singh, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr.Satyakam, ASC for GNCTD.

Ms.Manika Tripathy, Advocate for DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 4455/2015**

SUSHIL ARORA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Hemant Singh, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr.Gursharan Singh, Advocate for R-1.
Ms.Shobhana Takiar, Advocate for DDA.

+ **W.P.(C)6878/2015**

PREM LATA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Hemant Singh, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr.Sanjoy Ghose with
Mr.Vikramaditya, Advocate for R-1 to 3.
Ms.Manika Tripathy, Advocate for DDA.

%

Date of Decision: 28th January, 2016

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

J U D G M E N T

MANMOHAN, J: (Oral)

1. The present writ petitions have been filed primarily seeking a direction to the respondent no.1/SDM to recommend the cases of the

petitioners for allotment of DDA flats under “Housing Scheme for Rehabilitation of Punjab Migrants.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners states that in none of the cases the respondent no.1 has formally rejected the representation of the petitioners for allotment of DDA flat by way of a reasoned order.

3. Learned counsel for respondent no.1 state that names of the petitioners appear in the rejection list filed along with the counter-affidavits.

4. In rejoinder, learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioners have been placed in the rejection list without giving any opportunity of hearing. He also states that the reasons given by the respondent no.1 are contrary to the facts on record.

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid, this Court directs the respondent no.1/SDM to treat the present writ petitions as representations of the petitioners and decide the same by way of a reasoned order, after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

6. Respondent no.1/SDM is directed to decide the representations of the petitioners within a period of eight weeks. In the event, representations of the petitioners are rejected, the petitioners shall be at liberty to take action in accordance with law.

7. It is however clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the controversy. The rights and contentions of all parties are left open.

Order dasti.

MANMOHAN, J

JANUARY 28, 2016
KA