

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-19229-2017

Date of Decision: 28.8.2017

Ram Kumar Yadav

...Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Urban Development Authority, Panchkula and others

...Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL.
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.**

PRESENT: Mr. Shailendra Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. In this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to issue allotment letter to him for plot No. 450, Sector 18 (Defence), HUDA, Rewari measuring 10 marlas allotted in the draw of lots held in October-November, 2010.

2. The petitioner submitted an application, Annexure P-1, for the allotment of a 10 marla plot in Sector 18 (Defence), HUDA, Rewari and deposited the earnest money of ₹ 1,65,500/- with respondent No.3. The draw of lots was held and the petitioner was allotted plot No. 450, Sector 18 (Defence), HUDA, Rewari measuring 10 marla as is clear from the list dated 14.3.2017 (Annexure P-2). However, no allotment letter was issued to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner moved the representations dated

respondent No.3 for issuance of allotment letter of plot No.450, Sector 18 (Defence), HUDA, Rewari measuring 10 marlas, but no response has been received till date. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that for the relief claimed in the writ petition, the petitioner has sent the representations dated 21.1.2013, 6.2.2014 and 25.4.2016 (Annexures P-3 to P-5, respectively) to respondent No.3, but no action has so far been taken thereon.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, perusing the present petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we dispose of the present petition by directing respondent No.3 to take a decision on the representations dated 21.1.2013, 6.2.2014 and 25.4.2016 (Annexures P-3 to P-5, respectively), in accordance with law by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of the order.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

August 28, 2017
gbs

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No