IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.6320 of 2016
Date of decision: 16.4.2018

Gurdeep Kaur …Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Ms.Savita, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.H.S.Sitta, AAG Punjab.

Mr.Harit Sharma, Advocate.

*****

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

This petition is preferred at the instance of one Gurdeep Kaur who has prayed for reducing the price of the land to be allotted from Rs.255/- per square yard to Rs.100/- per square yard.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was allotted the land @ Rs.255/- per square yard though at one point of time it was decided that it would be allotted @ Rs.100/- per square yard.

The respondents have filed reply in which they have also attached the order passed in revision petition under Section 11(4) of the Punjab Urban Estates (Development and Regulation) Act, 1964 by the Principal Secretary Housing and Urban Development, Punjab, Chandigarh. The said revision petition was filed by Baba Sheikh Farid Memorial School (Regd.), Mohali on whose behalf, this petition has been filed by Gurdeep Kaur alleging herself to be a member of the Trust. The said revision petition was dismissed with the objection that so far no allotment has been made to the petitioner and only an offer of allotment has been made. Moreover, in the said petition, the revisional

MEENU KUMARI
2018.04.20 10:42
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court, Chandigarh

authority has also discussed the cause shown by the petitioner with regard to deduction of the price of land and ultimately, the revision petition was dismissed on 28.11.1995. Instead of challenging the said order dated 28.11.1995 at that time, the present writ petition has been filed in the year 2016 even without disclosing it that the School had earlier filed revision petition which was dismissed on 28.11.1995.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands as the petitioner has concealed the order dated 28.11.1995 from this Court at the time of filing the petition which has been produced by the respondents with their reply.

Thus, the petition is dismissed though without any order as to costs.

April 16, 2018 **(Rakesh Kumar Jain)**
Meenu **Judge**

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

MEENU KUMARI
2018.04.20 10:42
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court, Chandigarh