

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

CWP-7963-2019

Date of decision: 11.4.2019

Maman Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr.Sushil Jain, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr.Vikrant Pamboo, DAG, Haryana

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

The present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed for quashing the impugned letter dated 27.2.2019 (Annexure P-7) issued by Deputy Commissioner, Sonipat, whereby earlier proposal for establishing the Industrial Training Institution (for short ITI) in village Juan-2 (Sonipat) has been discarded by submitting a new proposal for establishing ITI in village Juan -1 (Sonipat).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No.5 Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Sonipat and Sub Divisional Officer (Civil) personally visited the site and prepared a report wherein it was opined that the land of village Juan-2 can be utilized for establishing ITI. Thereafter, respondent No.4 Deputy Commissioner, Sonipat after considering said report had opined that the shamlat land of the said village is more appropriate for ITI and had forwarded the report of respondent No.5 to respondent No.2- Director, Development and Panchayats, Haryana for

approval. Thereafter, under influence, respondent No.2 after raising certain objections sent back the case to rectify the same. But now Deputy Commissioner Sonipat vide letter dated 27.2.2019 (Annexure P-7) has forwarded the case for establishing the ITI in village Juan-1 without considering the earlier report, wherein it was mentioned that the land of village Juan-2 is more appropriate than village Juan-1.

Heard.

The grievance of the petitioner is that the proposed ITI be established in village Juan-2 instead of village Juan-1. Perusal of the file reveals that the authorities vested with the powers to finalise the proposal have taken into consideration all the pros and cons for establishing the ITI in village Juan-1. It is an administrative decision taken by the empowered authorities taking into account the feasibility and accessibility of the proposed institution, which calls for no interference in exercise of writ jurisdiction. Needless to mention here that the petitioner has no locus standi to question the administrative decision, especially when Panchayat of village Juan-2 has not come forward with any objection in shifting the proposal of establishing ITI in village Juan-1 instead of their own village.

In view of the above, the present petition being devoid of any merit, is hereby dismissed.

11.4.2019

gsv

[JITENDRA CHAUHAN]
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No