

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

116

**CWP No. 15213 of 2020**

**Date of Decision: September 23, 2020**

Suraj Prakash and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.N. SATYANARAYANA  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ARCHANA PURI**

Present: Mr. Manish Sangwan, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**S.N. SATYANARAYANA, J.**

This writ petition is filed by the oustees of the land seeking allotment of a plot under Oustees Quota Scheme of 2015.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1 and Mr. Deepak Sabharwal, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 2 to 4.

Petitioners herein are landlords whose lands are acquired by the respondent State on two occasions, once on 17.04.1989 when 9 Bighas and 7 Biswas of their land was acquired under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act. Subsequently, it is stated that around 8 Bighas of their land was acquired on 15.05.1997, under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act. It is stated that on both occasions the lands were acquired within revenue estate of Wazirabad, District Gurugram. The petitioners would further state

that in the year 2015 a scheme was introduced by the respondent State for allotment of plots to land losers under Oustees Quota Scheme. The petitioners herein apprehends that though the application which is filed by them is required to be considered straightway, the same may not be considered and it may be rejected in the guise the same being subjected to scrutiny as per public notice issued by the HSVP. According to the petitioners the Scheme does not provide for scrutiny of the application, therefore, the process of scrutiny of application is only introduced to reject their application.

Mr. Deepak Sabharwal, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 2 to 4 would submit that if the petitioners furnishes the particulars of acquisition of the year 1989 and 1997 that would be sufficient. In any event, the names of the petitioners would be included in the list of Oustees to be considered for allotment of plot by draw of lots, which would be taken up tomorrow. His submission is placed on record.

In the meanwhile, learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that since there is a statement on behalf of learned counsel for respondent Nos. 2 to 4 stating that the names of the petitioners would be included in the list of applicants for draw of lots, which would be conducted tomorrow, he would not pursue this matter and accordingly this matter be closed.

Placing the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned counsel for respondent Nos. 2 to 4 in the aforesaid manner, this writ petition is disposed of. However, it is made clear that in the event of their being any failure on the part of respondent Nos. 2 to 4 in

complying with the undertaking given before this Court, it is open for learned counsel for the petitioners to seek revival of this writ petition.

(S.N.SATYANARAYANA)  
JUDGE

(ARCHANA PURI)  
JUDGE

September 23, 2020  
Vgulati

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No