

102
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
10/1/2019 15:30
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CWP-40656-2018 (O/M)
Date of decision : 1.1.2019

Mohit Sachdeva

..... Petitioner (s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present:- Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate,
for petitioner.

-.-

-.-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Heard.

The petitioner seeks allotment of a booth on the ground that he was in possession of phar area after death of his father in the year 2001.

The learned counsel for petitioner has fairly conceded that in the survey conducted by respondents, name of petitioner or his father is not mentioned. However, he claims that earlier his father and now petitioner was/is in possession of phar area.

We are of the view that it requires recording of evidence. Therefore, there is no ground to entertain writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of Constitution of India.

Disposed of with liberty to petitioner to file a civil suit to establish his claim.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

1.1.2019
sjks

Whether speaking order	:	Yes	/	No
Whether reportable	:	Yes	/	No