

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-244-2020(O&M)
Date of Decision: 07.10.2020

V.Vishal

..... Petitioner

versus

UT Chandigarh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. Lalit Rishi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anil Mehta, Additional Standing Counsel
for respondents No. 1 to 3.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL)

This case has been taken up through Video Conferencing via Webex facility in the light of Pandemic Covid-19 situation and as per instructions.

The instant petition was filed raising a grievance that the petitioner in terms of rule 9 (vi) of The Government Residences (Chandigarh Administration General Pool) Allotment Rules, 1996 was entitled to submit maximum three options/bids for allotment of a Government house between 1st to 8th of every month. Precise grievance raised was that the petitioner had been allowed to opt for a house only on one occasion and thereafter had not been allowed to participate in the subsequent bidding process. Entire case projected on behalf of the petitioner was that the two remaining options/bids were not permitted and it was contrary to the statutory rules governing the allotment of house to a Government employee.

Writ petition had come up for preliminary hearing before this Court on 08.01.2020 and the following order was passed:-

“ It is the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that as per Rule 9 (vi) of The Government Residences (Chandigarh Administration General Pool) Allotment Rules, 1996, the Government employee is entitled to submit maximum three options/bids for allotment of a Government house from 1st to 8th of every month. Counsel contends that the petitioner had opted for a house only on one occasion but he had not been allowed to participate in the subsequent bidding process which is contrary to the statutory rules governing the allotment of houses to the Government employees. He, thus, contends that the action of the respondents is not sustainable and deserves to be set aside.

Notice of motion for 15.01.2020.

Petitioner may be permitted to participate in the bidding process but the final outcome should not be declared.

This shall, however, be subject to the outcome to the writ petition.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the counsel for the petitioner under signatures of Bench Secretary of this Court”.

Court has been informed that in compliance of the interim directions petitioner has been permitted to participate in the bidding process and whereby he has exercised three options/bids.

Learned counsel representing UT, Chandigarh submits that permission be now granted to declare the final outcome of the bidding process in which the petitioner had been permitted to participate and in case the petitioner is successful he would be given allotment as per options exercised.

In view of such fair stand taken on behalf of UT Chandigarh writ petition is disposed of as infructuous.

Respondent-UT Chandigarh is granted permission to declare the final outcome of the bidding process in which the petitioner had participated. The final outcome/declaration of the bidding process would be binding upon both the parties.

No further directions are required to be passed.

Petition disposed of.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

07.10.2020
sunita

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No