

CWP-3942-2022

Date of Decision: 02.03.2022

Hari Mittar

....Petitioner

VS

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Saransh Sabharwal, Advocate for the petitioner

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is aggrieved because a fair price shop has been allotted to respondent No. 5. His allegation is that she does not fulfill the requisite criteria. For redressal he had made a representation dated 10.09.2021 to the competent authority but no action was taken and, thus, CWP No. 23893 of 2021 was filed. The said writ petition was disposed of with a direction to the competent authority to decide the representation dated 10.09.2021. The said representation has been decided, copy of which has been annexed as Annexure P-8 wherein it has been held that respondent No. 5 is not in Government or private employment and just because she is a member of Block Samiti she cannot be denied allotment.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon order dated 27.09.2019 passed by this Court in CWP No. 18673 of 2016 tiled as ***Komal Rani vs. State of Haryana and others.*** It is his submission that an allottee should not be a close relative of a sitting Sarpanch or Panch of the Gram Panchayat.

In this case there is no allegation that respondent No. 5 is close to a sitting Panch or Sarpanch of the concerned Gram Panchayat and, thus, reliance upon the aforesaid order is misconceived.

No other point has been raised or argued. The writ petition is without any merit and is dismissed.

02.03.2022

reena

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE