

CWP-25191-2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-25191-2022

Date of decision : 28.02.2023

Lohit @ Rohit Kumar

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

Union Territory Administration, Chandigarh and another

....Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL**

Present: Mr. Kapil Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anil Mehta, Senior Standing Counsel with
Mr. Sumeet Jain and Mr. Varun Dutta, Advocates
for U.T. Chandigarh.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

On 29.11.2022, following order was passed:-

“The petitioner was found eligible for allotment of tenement in lieu of Jhuggi in Palsora Colony, U.T. Chandigarh. In this regard reference has been made to the list of eligible candidates published in newspaper (Dainik Bhaskar) on 09.07.2003 (P-4). The name of the petitioner figures at Sr. No. 2412 in the said list. The provisions were made for allotting tenements in Sector 56 Chandigarh. The eligibility of the petitioner was subject to final verification of the documents.

Mr. Mehta, learned counsel for respondent-U.T. states that a letter dated 30.10.2021 was written to the petitioner asking him to submit the requisite documents for verification of his claim. Even a public notice dated

CWP-25191-2022

25.05.2014 was issued calling upon all eligible candidates to submit their documents. The petitioner did not respond to either of them. It is accordingly contended that the claim of the petitioner now cannot be considered.

The rehabilitation of Juggi and Slum dwellers is an on going process.

As the petitioner was found eligible to file his claim in the year, 2003, Mr. Mehta, learned counsel for respondent-U.T. is requested to verify whether the petitioner's case could be considered in any other scheme or policy.

Adjourned to 16.02.2023.”

In pursuance to the said order, Mr. Anil Mehta, Senior Standing Counsel for U.T. Chandigarh, informs the Court that as of now, there is no scheme or policy under which the claim of the petitioner can be considered, and further that the petitioner has not yet submitted any document which would substantiate his claim with regard to his eligibility for allotment.

In view of the above, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE

28.02.2023
Harish

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No