

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(269)

CWP-13446-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: - 04.12.2023

Amrendra Sharan

....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Akhilesh Vyas, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anil Chawla, Senior Panel Counsel
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Rajesh Tushar, Advocate
for Mr. I.S. Sidhu, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 and 3.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to conduct a fair and transparent allotment in accordance with the House Allotment Rules of NITTTR Chandigarh. Other prayers have also been made in the present petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a representation dated 25.05.2022 (Annexure P-14) through email and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case the competent

authority of respondent No.2 considers the same in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.2 would consider the said representation dated 25.05.2022 (Annexure P-14), sent by the petitioner through email, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of three weeks from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent No.2 to consider the representation dated 25.05.2022 (Annexure P-14), sent by the petitioner through email, within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case the competent authority of respondent No.2 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible. In case, the competent authority of respondent No.2 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of three weeks.

5. Needless to say that in case the pleas of the petitioners are rejected, it would be open to the petitioner to challenge the same in accordance with law.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits

of the case and the competent authority of respondent No.2 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

7. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of in view of the above-said order.

December 04, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No