

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

106

CWP No.20683 of 2021(O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.04.2022

Ved Singh and another

...Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents.

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

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Anil Chawla, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 4.

Amol Rattan Singh, J.(Oral)

By this petition, filed under the provisions of Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners have prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus seeking a direction to respondent No.2 to decide the appeal dated 19.11.2020 (Annexure P-20) filed by the petitioners on account of rejection of their claim for allotment of a plot under the oustee quota, on the ground that the petitioners were not the owners of the acquired land before issuance of the notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act. The petitioners have further prayed for a direction to the respondents to allot a residential plot to them in the oustees category, by conducting a fresh draw of lots, for which they have already applied vide an application dated 15.12.2018, Annexure P-15 and P-16, (along with earnest money), in lieu of the advertisement dated 30.10.2018 (Annexure P-14).

Along with the reply filed on behalf of the respondents-HSVP, an order dated 15.11.2021 passed by four Officers (it is not stated if that is a specific committee or not), has been annexed, the last para of which

states that the petitioners were not owners of the land mentioned in the online application form submitted by them though their land too was acquired; but since the particulars given in the online application did not match with the details of the land owned by the petitioners, hence, their claim cannot be considered presently and has been rejected.

It is further stated that the petitioners would be at liberty to apply under the oustee policy as is prevalent for allotment of plots under the oustee quota as and when applications are invited as per the policy.

That being so, though counsel for the petitioners is not present, we see no reason to continue with the petition. It is consequently dismissed but with liberty to the petitioners to avail of their remedy, if they wish to, against the impugned order and of course, they would always be at liberty to apply for allotment of plots under the oustee quota in terms of the policy.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

APRIL 7, 2022
‘D. Gulati’

(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE