

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

- [1] Civil Writ Petition No.3203 of 2017.
Date of Decision: February 20, 2017
Manjeet Kaur and othersPetitioners
versus
Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration and othersRespondents
- [2] Civil Writ Petition No.3208 of 2017.
Baldev Singh and othersPetitioners
versus
Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration and othersRespondents
- [3] Civil Writ Petition No.3237 of 2017.
Gurbachan Singh and othersPetitioners
versus
Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration and othersRespondents
- [4] Civil Writ Petition No.3316 of 2017.
Sohan Lal and othersPetitioners
versus
Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration and othersRespondents
- [5] Civil Writ Petition No.3317 of 2017.
Kulvir Singh and othersPetitioners
versus
Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration and othersRespondents

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

Present: Mr.Ramandeep Singh Pandher, Advocate, for the petitioners.

-.-

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of the above-captioned writ petitions as
the point in issue involved in these cases is common in nature.

For brevity, the facts are being extracted from CWP No.3203 of

2017.

[2] The petitioners were originally residents of villages Mandhrian, Bajwara and Kanthala. Lands of villages alongwith *shamlat deh* were acquired for the development of IInd phase of Chandigarh City. The land and residential houses of the petitioners were also acquired for the said public purpose resulting into resettlement of the petitioners in nearby villages which now fall in the adjoining district of SAS Nagar Mohali (Punjab).

[3] The petitioners on this premise claim themselves to be 'local displaced persons' (oustees) and seek directions to the Chandigarh Administration to formulate a Scheme for rehabilitation of oustees of Chandigarh Phase-II. The petitioners have further averred that in the similar manner some villages were acquired for the development of Chandigarh City Phase-I and all the affected residents of those villages have been rehabilitated by allotting them residential plots or dwelling units. The petitioners thus allege discrimination and urge that they being similarly placed uprooted land-losers are entitled to be rehabilitated by the Chandigarh Administration. The petitioners in this regard rely upon the decisions of this Court dated 06.09.2012 passed in CWP No.14543 of 2011 (Mohd. Akram and others versus U.T. Chandigarh and others (P-14); 20.11.2012 passed in CWP No.18750 of 2008 (Sukhdev Singh and others versus Union Territory, Chandigarh and others (P-15), and 05.12.2013 passed in CWP No.14300 of 1996 (Mohan Singh versus UT of Chandigarh and others and other connected cases (P-16), wherein also similarly placed oustees of Chandigarh approached this Court for their rehabilitation. In the last cited decision (P-16) even assurance was given to this Court that 166 dwelling units constructed by the Chandigarh Housing Board shall be

allotted to the oustees on 'no profit no loss' basis.

[4] We find from the record that the petitioners have raised their claim from time to time by way of various representations including dated 25.09.2012 (P-13) etc. Since the petitioners' case is that their claim is under consideration but no decision is being taken by the authorities, we dispose of this writ petition without expressing any views on merits, with a direction to the respondents to treat these writ petitions as comprehensive representation on behalf of the petitioners and redress their grievances by passing a reasoned order within a period of four months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order.

[5] The petitioners are directed to deposit six copies of the writ petitions with the Registry which shall be sent to the respondents alongwith a copy of this order.

[6] Ordered accordingly.

[7] Dasti.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

February 20, 2017
mohinder

[SUDIP AHLUWALIA]
JUDGE

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