

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

**CWP-5105-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.03.2022**

Meenakshi

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana & others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA.**

Present:- Mr. Krishan Daaria, Advocate for the petitioner.

...

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

Counsel claims that Plot No.568, Sector-19, Panchkula was allotted in the name of the father of the petitioner. Even construction thereupon was effected.

Instant writ petition has been filed seeking a mandamus for directing the respondent/HSVP to allot in favour of the petitioner the adjoining plot i.e. Plot No.569 on the sole basis that since the respondents had not maintained the adjoining plot and rather it is the petitioner who has been putting the effort for the same, she was vested with a right of allotment of such adjoining vacant plot. The prayer in the instant writ petition is not founded on the strength of any statutory provision or for that matter any executive instruction. It is just a wishful claim.

Confronted with a situation where this Court was dismissing the writ petition, counsel seeks withdrawal of the same.

Petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

**(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE**

15.03.2022

harjeet

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?
2. Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No