

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

CWP-15248-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision:- 09.10.2017

Gaurav Bhandari

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.J. VAZIFDAR, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

Present:- Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

* * * *

S.J. VAZIFDAR, C.J. (ORAL)

The petitioner claims to have been the tenant in respect of two shops in Amritsar. These shops were taken over under Durgiana Mandir Scheme and in lieu thereof the tenants were to be given alternate premises. The petitioner states that he was entitled to two separate alternate premises and not just one. Initially, his name did not appear in the list at all. Subsequently, his name appeared in the list. According to him, the official records disclose that he was entitled to two shops on the basis of two tenancies. However, subsequently, the respondents allotted him only one shop. The correspondence does not indicate any consideration of the petitioner's case that he is entitled to two shops. In a communication dated 29.04.2015, the only thing stated is that there was only one unit on the spot "as per which one shop has to be allotted".

2. The respondents firstly ought to consider the petitioner's entitlement to the second shop. If it is found that he is entitled to a second shop, the manner of

accommodating him in a second shop either at the site itself or at some other place or to grant him the relief in some other manner must be considered.

3. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of by directing the respondents to do so after affording the petitioner an opportunity of being heard.

(S.J. VAZIFDAR)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE

09.10.2017

Amodh

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No