

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

**CWP-15444-2023(O&M)
Date of decision: 04.12.2023**

Rajesh Garg

... Petitioner

Versus

Greater Ludhiana Area Development Authority (GLADA) and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL**

Present: Ms. Taanvi Dhull, Advocate, for
Mr. Lakshay Bector, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. V.G. Jauhar, Addl. AG, Punjab.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner participated in the auction conducted by the respondent-authorities for allotment of shop(s)-cum-flat(s) at Dugri Phase II, Urban Estate, Ludhiana. The petitioner being the highest bidder was adjudged H1, and was allotted SCF-261, measuring 132.64 sq. meters. As per the terms and conditions of the auction, the petitioner deposited Rs.3,49,716/- on 18.12.2022. Whereafter, the authorities were required to issue a Regular Letter of Allotment, but, on the contrary, the amount deposited by the petitioner was credited in his bank account on September 1, 2023.

The limited grievance that the petitioner has is that the respondents neither passed any order to scrap the auction, nor assigned any reasons/grounds, which impelled them to reject the bid submitted by the

petitioner. And, even the representation, the respondents were served with on 06.02.2023, has also failed to invoke any response. Thus, learned counsel for the petitioner asserts that the action of the respondent-authorities is apparently arbitrary and unsustainable. In support of her submissions, she has relied upon the decisions of this Court in **Surja Ram v. State of Haryana and another, 1984 AIR (PH) 282**, and the Supreme Court in **M/s Star Enterprises etc. v. City and Industrial Development Corporation of Maharashtra Ltd. and others, 1990(3) SCC 280**.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. V.G. Jauhar, learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab, is present in Court, and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

At the outset, he submits, for the respondent-authorities apparently failed to pass any order justifying the rejection of the bid submitted by the petitioner, and cancelling the auction, let this petition be disposed of, at this stage, to enable the respondents to deal with the concerns/grievances of the petitioner as sought to be raised in this petition. And pass the necessary orders assigning reasons in support thereof.

That being so, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that nothing substantive survives in the petition, and the same be disposed of in terms of the statement made by learned State counsel. However, the authorities be directed to pass the required order within a specified time.

To this, learned State counsel submits that the necessary orders shall be passed by the competent authority within a period of three weeks from today.

The petition is accordingly disposed of in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties.

Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion on the merits of the case of either party, for, as indicated above, the competent authority shall examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

04.12.2023
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES/NO
Whether Reportable:	YES/NO