

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

224

**Civil Writ Petition No.20165 of 2017
Date of decision: May 03, 2018**

Mohammad Sahani

....Petitioner

versus

Chandigarh Administration and others

....Respondents

***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL***

Present: Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaiveer S. Chandail, Advocate for
Mr. Kirpal Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Abhilaksh Grover, Advocate
for the respondents-UT, Chandigarh.

Mr. Puneet Soni, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking quashing the order dated 29.01.2016 (**Annexure P-17**) passed by respondent No.4, whereby the claim of the petitioner for allotment of flat was rejected under the Chandigarh Small Flats Scheme, 2006 and also quashing the order dated 30.05.2017 (**Annexure P-21**) passed by respondent No.3 vide which the appeal filed by the petitioner on 27.04.2016 (**Annexure P-19**) was also dismissed.

2. A perusal of the orders dated 29.01.2016 (**Annexure P-17**) and 30.05.2017 (**Annexure P-21**) shows that the authorities have recorded certain findings of facts which according to the petitioner are not correct. It was also contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that even the objections taken with regard to the fabrication of Bio-metric receipt (Annexure P-15) is also not correct.

3. Reply on behalf of respondent No.3 has been filed in Court today. The same is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that he may be allowed to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Civil Court as certain facts are required to be established by leading cogent and reliable evidence.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents plead no objection to the withdrawal of the writ petition.

6. Dismissed as withdrawn. It shall, however, be open to the petitioner to take recourse to the remedies as may be available to him, in accordance with law.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

May 03, 2018
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No