

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-9137-2023

Date of decision : 01.05.2023

Chirag Aghi

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHLPresent: Mr.Ishnoor Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Upasana Dhawan, AAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus for directing the official respondents to decide the representations dated 26.11.2022 (Annexure P-4) and 02.04.2023 (Annexure P-5) as the property ID of the petitioner is not being granted despite being the owner in possession of the property whose ID is being sought.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has given a representation to the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Panipat, dated 02.04.2023 with a prayer for correction in the house tax property ID and other prayers have also been made. It is submitted that the petitioner would be claiming ownership on the basis of two registered deeds dated 21.11.2022 which had been executed by father

the provisions of Sections 99 and 101 of the Haryana Municipal Corporation Act, 1994, the Commissioner is the competent authority to consider the prayers made by the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner would be satisfied in case the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Panipat, is directed to consider the representation dated 02.04.2023, in accordance with law and to take appropriate action thereon.

3. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Panipat to consider the representation dated 02.04.2023 and in case the Commissioner finds merit in the plea raised by the petitioner, then, necessary action, in accordance with law, be taken as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order. In case the plea raised by the petitioner is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order would be passed by the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Panipat, within the aforesaid period.

4. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Panipat, would consider the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

May 01, 2023

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No