

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

118/119/120

Date of decision: 25.11.2021

1. CWP-21152-2021

RAJESH MITTAL AND OTHERSPetitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondent(s)

2. CWP-21159-2021

RAMESH AND ANRPetitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondent(s)

3. CWP-21172-2021

JAI KISHAN AND ORSPetitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present : Mr. Ajit Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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.

This order shall dispose of CWP-21152-2021 titled as Rajesh Mittal and Others vs. State of Haryana and Others, CWP-21159-2021 titled as Ramesh and Anr vs. State of Haryana and Others and CWP-21172-2021 titled as Jai Kishan and Ors vs. State of Haryana and Others, as the issue involved is common.

We find that the petitioners, in these three connected writ petitions, are seeking quashing of certain contents/conditions made in the allotment letters.

Pleadings on record would suggest and rather counsel during the course of hearing concedes that the allotment of the plot in question has itself been cancelled.

Counsel was accordingly confronted as to how this Court would deal with a challenge to any particular condition in an allotment letter in a situation where the allotment itself has since been set aside.

At this stage, counsel seeks withdrawal of the writ petitions, with liberty to file a petition afresh, to raise a challenge to the cancellation of the allotment on the grounds as may be available in accordance with law.

Disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

25.11.2021

S.Sharma(syr)

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*