

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

**C.O.C.P. No.2927 of 2016
Date of Decision: 08.05.2017**

Dharamvir Singh @ Dharamveer

..... Petitioner

Versus

Vikas Gupta, Chief Administrator,
Haryana Urban Development Authority and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Madan Pal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Kundra, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate for the respondents.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The petitioner, being oustee was entitled for allotment of plot/site in terms of the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Schemes, but his claim was rejected, had filed CWP No.6073 of 2015, which was disposed of vide order dated 27.04.2016 (**Annexure P-1**) in terms of the order dated 04.04.2016, passed by the Division Bench of this Court, in CWP No.6684 of 2014 and other connected matters. The operative part of the said order reads as under:-

“ That being so, the orders that have been assailed in these writ petitions are quashed. Respondents are directed to re-consider the claim of each of the petitioners, strictly in terms of the decisions, referred to above, and the relevant policies in operation. We were/are informed that pursuant to the interim orders passed by this court, in certain matters in this bunch, plots/sites were reserved for the petitioners in those cases. If that is so, those sites/plots shall be kept reserved till formal orders are passed and communicated to the concerned landowners. However, respondents shall be free to allot either the reserved site or even a different site, in the event the petitioners, in those cases, are found entitled for allotment. We also consider it necessary to observe that vide this order we have neither

determined the eligibility nor entitlement of any of the petitioners for allotment of a plot/site, for all these questions shall now have to be determined by the concerned authorities on the basis of the material on record.

The entire exercise shall be completed within a period of four months from today. Needless to assert that the authorities shall pass comprehensive order assigning reasons in support of the decision arrived at.

The writ petitions are accordingly disposed of in the above terms. ”

Since the needful was not done, hence the present contempt petition.

Upon notice, reply on behalf of the respondents has been filed, wherein it is mentioned that in compliance of the aforesaid order dated 27.04.2016 (P-1), speaking order 21.11.2016 (Annexure R-3) has already been passed, whereby earnest money deposited by the petitioner has been refunded to the petitioner along with interest.

At the time of hearing, learned Counsel for the respondents submits that the aforesaid directions passed by this Court have already been complied with. This fact is not disputed by learned opposite Counsel.

In view of the above, no further action is warranted.

Accordingly, the present contempt petition stands dismissed as infructuous.

May 08, 2017

Gagan

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>