

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-9307-2018

Date of Decision: 19.4.2018

Vikram

....Petitioner.

Versus

Haryana Urban Development Authority, Panchkula and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Vivek Khatri, 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 handover the possession of industrial plot No.204-L, Roz-Ka-Meo, Industrial Estate, measuring 450 square yards, allotted to the petitioner in the draw of lots vide allotment letter dated 30.4.2008 (Annexure P-5).

2. The respondents have invited applications for allotment of industrial plots in various Industrial Estates including at Roz-Ka-Meo (Text Tile Valley). As per the brochure dated 3.8.2007 (Annexure P-1), the booking commenced from 3.8.2007 and closed on 31.8.2007. In response thereto, the petitioner applied for the allotment of industrial plot at Roz-Ka-

prescribed fee. Vide letter dated 17.9.2007 (Annexure P-3), respondent No.1 asked the petitioner to participate in the interview for the allotment of industrial units to be held on 15.10.2007 and as such the petitioner appear before the interview committee on the said date. Respondent No.3 vide letter dated 19.3.2008 (Annexure P-4) informed the date regarding the draw of lots to be held. In the draw of lots, the petitioner was successful and, therefore, he was allotted plot No.204-L at Roz-Ka-Meo vide allotment letter dated 30.4.2008 (Annexure P-5). The petitioner vide letter dated 10.5.2008 (Annexure P-6) furnished the demand draft of ₹ 74,250/- to respondent No.3 on account of installment of the said plot which was duly received by respondent No.3 vide receipt dated 14.5.2008 (Annexure P-7). Further, vide letter dated 25.4.2009 (Annexure P-8), the petitioner deposited another installment of ₹ 1,48,500/- by way of demand draft with respondent No.3. The said amount was duly received by respondent No.3 vide receipt dated 28.4.2009 (Annexure P-9). Again vide application dated 26.2.2013 (Annexure P-10), the petitioner deposited demand draft of ₹ 1,50,000/- on account of installment of the plot in question. However, the possession of the said industrial plot was not handed over to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner moved the representations (Annexures P-11 to P-14 and P-16, respectively) to respondents No.3 for handing over the possession of the plot in question, 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 (Annexures P-11 to P-14 and P-16, 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 (Annexures P-11 to P-14 and P-16, respectively), in accordance with law by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of the order.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

April 19, 2018
gbs

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No