

Braham Dutt

.....Petitioner

versus

Haryana Urban Development Authority and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY.  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL.**

\*\*\*

Present: Mr. R.S. Kundu, Advocate  
for the petitioner

Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate for  
Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate  
for the respondents - HUDA

\*\*\*

**DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)****CM No. 4464 of 2019**

This is an application for impleading the legal representative of the petitioner as he has expired during the pendency of the petition.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and Smt. Shakuntala resident of House No. 1042 , Sector 2, Rohtak, Haryana, is brought on record as legal representative of the deceased petitioner subject to all just exceptions.

Amended Memo of Parties annexed with the application is taken on record.

**CWP No. 22989 of 2017**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that alternative plot has been allotted to the petitioner but there was delay in handing over the physical possession, therefore, he is entitled for interest on the amount deposited. He

further submits that allotment was made in the year 2018 whereas it was of the year 2003, therefore, claim of the petitioner for interest be considered in view of the policy decision annexed with the reply as Annexure R-5 .

Accordingly, the petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of petitioner for interest in view of the policy decision (Annexure R-5). The necessary exercise be done within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**

**(SUDHIR MITTAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 10, 2019**  
*reena*

**Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No**

**Whether Reportable : Yes/No**