

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

CWP-22374-2021

Date of decision: 03.11.2021

Jasbir Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Vikram Rathore, Advocate for the petitioner.

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.

Petitioner seeks writ in the nature of mandamus to direct the concerned respondent/Greater Ludhiana, Development Authority, Ludhiana to allot a plot in his favour under the oustee's category as per policy dated 17.04.1974. Further prayer is for issuance of directions to the concerned authority to decide representation dated 11.08.2021 (Annexure P/8).

We have heard learned counsel at length and has perused the paper book.

We are of the considered view that no intervention in the matter is called for as the writ petition has been filed after an inordinate and unexplained delay.

As per pleaded case of the petitioner himself the land in question had been acquired in the year 1975. As per counsel the application for allotment of a plot under the oustee's category had been filed in the year 1982.

Such submission however is not substantiated by any material/documents on record.

Be that as it may, even if such assertion made by learned counsel is taken to be correct on its face value, no explanation is coming-forth as to why the petitioner remained silent for a period of four decades.

It would be apposite to take note of the representation placed on record at Annexure P-6 dated 16.06.2011 that the petitioner had made to the Chief Administrator, GLADA, Ludhiana. As per contents of such representation, applicant/petitioner had moved a representation and made an offer in the year 1984 to deposit money for allotment of plot but the same was declined. Thereafter, it is only on 24.05.2007 that the applicant/petitioner had again appeared before the official concerned and represented and put-forth his claim.

Repeated representations, if any, filed by the petitioner will not vest in him a recurring cause of action.

It is not open for a litigant to wake up after years and years and have the luxury of approaching the writ court at his own sweet will.

Writ petition is dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

03.11.2021
Vishal sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*