

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.2219 of 2017.
Date of Decision: February 07 , 2017

Priavrat and othersPetitioners

versus

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA.**

Present: Mr.Sanjeev Kodan, Advocate, for the petitioners.

:-

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

The petitioners are residents of Sector-6, Jhajjar. Their grievance is against the allotment of Dharamshala site to respondent No.4 in Sector-6, Jhajjar. The site has been allotted by Haryana Urban Development Authority after inviting applications. The petitioners claim that the site in question was originally earmarked for construction of a Community Centre, hence its allotment for Dharamshala would deprive them from common facility of Community Centre.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioners at a considerable length, we do not find any merit in this petition. Firstly, the allotment was made to respondent No.4 on 01.09.2014 (P-5). Admittedly, the construction has already commenced and at this belated stage, no interference in the allotment is called for. Secondly, the petitioners have nowhere sought a direction for earmarking the site for Community Centre. If there is any proposal for construction of Community Centre in Sector-6, Jhajjar, the petitioners are well within their right to approach the HUDA authorities to carve out an alternative site for construction of Community

Centre. We have no reason to doubt that such a request made by the petitioners shall be entertained and considered in accordance with bye-laws. Thirdly, the construction of Dharmshala is an integral part of social welfare scheme. Such like places are used for providing night shelters to poor persons who cannot afford stay at a commercial places in urban areas. Even the petitioners would be surely benefited with the construction of Dharmshala in Sector-6, Jhajjar for the purpose of organizing social functions etc. The plea that Sector-6, Jhajjar has been developed purely for rehabilitation of ex-army personnel is not a valid ground to say that a social organization like respondent No.4 cannot be allotted the subject site.

Dismissed.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

February 07, 2017
mohinder

[SUDIP AHLUWALIA]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No