

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

118

CWP-11185-2022

Date of Decision: 02.06.2022.

Surinder Kumar Garg

....Petitioner.

Versus

Union of India and others

....Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA**

Present: Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India with
Mr. Karan Kumar Jund, Central Government counsel
for respondent No.1 (Union of India).

Mr. Neeraj Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Rohit Kaushik, Advocate for respondent No.2 UT.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

By this petition, the petitioner seeks a direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to consider and decide the applications of the petitioner, dated 23.09.1998 and 09.11.1998 (copies Annexures P/4 and P/9), regarding allotment of a site under “The Allotment of Land to the Publishers of Newspapers in Sector-25, Chandigarh, on Leasehold Basis Scheme” 1998, (copy Annexure P/11).

On 23.05.2022, with none having appeared for the petitioner, the following order had been passed by this court:-

“In the interest of justice, adjourned to 02.06.2022.

However, it has to be observed that the petitioner is seeking allotment of land in terms of a scheme of the year 1998 (copy Annexure P-11), with him not having made any representation between 1999-2019 and with that representation rejected vide a communication Annexure P-23, on the ground that no such scheme was existent at that time.”

Today learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to the advertisement issued in the year 1998, vide a public notice (Annexure P/5), recently another publication, i.e. respondent No.4, 'Arth Parkash', has been allotted a site in Sector-29, Chandigarh. However, upon query to him as to when that site was allotted, he submits that his queries under the Right to Information Act, 2005 are not being answered.

The petitioner is basing his case on the aforesaid public notice in the year 1998, i.e. 24 years ago, and consequently unless he can show that a site was actually allotted pursuant to the same public notice very recently, we would not be inclined to entertain his claim at all, in view of the long delay and laches.

Consequently, this petition is disposed of with a direction to the Estate Officer, Sector-17, U.T., Chandigarh, to supply information to the petitioner within one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, as to when a site was allotted to respondent No.4; and whether it was allotted in pursuance to the public notice Annexure P/5 issued in the year 1998 (in terms of the scheme Annexure P/11) or on any other subsequent advertisement/notice issued. If it was pursuant to some subsequent notice/ scheme, a copy of the complete record thereof would be provided to the petitioner.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE

02.06.2022

komal

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No
Whether Reportable : Yes/ No