

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

CM-16042 & 16126-CWP-2019 in/and
CWP-29808-2019

Date of decision: 7.11.2019

Bimla Jain and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr.JP Rana, Advocate for
Mr.Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

CM-16042-CWP-2019

The present application is for impleading Director, Urban
Local Bodies Department, Haryana as respondent no.4.

For the reasons enumerated in the application, the same is
allowed and Director, Urban Local Bodies Department, Haryana is
ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.4.

Registry is directed to make the necessary amendment in
the memo of parties accordingly.

CM-16126-CWP-2019

Dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

CWP-29808-2019

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the

Constitution of India has been filed for issuance of direction to the

respondents to allot the site to the petitioner as per the Haryana Municipal Corporation Act, 1994 and Haryana Management of Municipal Properties and State Properties Rules, 2007.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners states that at this stage, he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.4 - Director, Urban Local Bodies Department, Haryana to treat the present petition as representation and decide the same expeditiously.

Heard.

A complete set of paper book has been handed over to Mr. Ayuwan Singh, AAG, Haryana in the Court today.

In view of the above, without advertng to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioners to submit a copy of this petition to respondent No.4 - Director, Urban Local Bodies Department, Haryana within two weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this judgment, who shall treat the same as representation and decide in accordance with law within six weeks thereafter. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioners is admissible to them, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to them, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioners is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking

order be passed in the matter.

Till the decision of the representation, show cause notice dated 18.6.2019 (Annexure P-7) be not acted upon.

7.11.2019
gsv

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?	Yes	/	No
Whether reportable?	Yes	/	No