

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

**Date of decision:30.01.2017**

Santosh Kumari

.....Petitioner

VS

Dr.Subhash Verma,Chairman,Ludhiana Improvement Trust

.....Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH**

Present:- Mr.Vikram Rathore,Advocate and  
Mr.Jaideep Verma,Advocate for the petitioner.

**Jaswant Singh,J(Oral)**

It is claimed that 416 square yards owned by the petitioner was acquired by the Improvement Trust Ludhiana under Sections 36 and 42 of the Punjab Town Improvement Trust Act vide notifications dated 8.7.1975 and 10.1.1977 respectively for formulation of 6 acres of developmental scheme. The petitioner concededly deposited earnest money of Rs.500/- (Rupees five hundred only) on 25.5.1979 for allotment of a plot under the “Local Displacement Persons” Category(for short LDP Category). Thereafter, except some affirmations like making representations she filed CWP 15283//2016 for allotment of a plot under the LDP Category which was disposed of with a direction dated 17.8.2016 to the Improvement Trust Ludhiana for passing a speaking order within three months. The said directions have culminated into passing of order dated 6.12.2016(P-4) whereby the petitioner is held entitled for a plot measuring 250-300 square yards on the current reserved price.

Grievance of the petitioner is that allotment is not being made

and hence alleges violation of order dated 17.8.2016.

At the time of hearing,learned counsel for the petitioner has miserably failed to show right of the petitioner to be entitled for a plot much less at the reserved price applicable in the year 1975. The claim of the petitioner is also hit by the principle of law of limitation and even the order dated 6.12.2016(P-4) holding her entitled for allotment of a plot does not reveal the basis for such entitlement. This Court vide order dated 17.8.2016 had only directed the authorities to take a decision on her representation dated 14.12.2015 in accordance with law which does not mean that the law of limitation or the basis for such entitlement, at all was to be given a go-bye.

In view of the above,instant contempt petition is dismissed.

30.01.2017  
joshi

(Jaswant Singh)  
Judge

|                               |        |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/<br>reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable:           | Yes/No |