

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

CWP-22795-2023
Date of decision: 02.11.2023

Sangeeta RaniPetitioner

Versus

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) and another
.....Respondents

2 **CWP-22812-2023**

NeelamPetitioner

Versus

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) and another
.....Respondents

3 **CWP-22813-2023**

Bhim SainPetitioner

Versus

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) and another
.....Respondents

4 **CWP-22832-2023**

SumedhaPetitioner

Versus

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) and another
.....Respondents

5 **CWP-22842-2023**

SatyavanPetitioner

Versus

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) and another
.....Respondents

6

CWP-23163-2023

Dr. Adiya Chaudhry

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

7

CWP-22400-2023

Sunita Kumari

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

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

**Present: Mr. Dinesh Babu Khurana, Advocate,
for the petitioners
(in CWPs-22795, 22812, 22832, 22813 & 22842-2023).**

Mr. Divyam Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CWP-23163-2023).

Mr. Anshul Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CWP-22400-2023).

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional A.G, Haryana, and
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate,
for the respondent-HSVP.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, all these writ petitions are being disposed of by a common order, as they involve a common question for consideration. However, the facts are being derived from CWP-22795-2023.

On October 10, 2023, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had passed the following order:-

“Inter alia contends, while referring to the facts of CWP-22795- 2023 that the petitioner had participated in the auction held on 14.05.2023 for residential plot at Karnal. The pre-requisite deposit was made for plot No.751GP measuring 10 marlas, the reserve price of which was Rs.1,25,91,400/- and the petitioner’s bid was for Rs.2,16,21,400/- due to which she had made the requisite deposit to complete the 10% amount. The said amount was thereafter refunded on 13.09.2023 (Annexure P-6) without giving any reason as to why the bid was cancelled as the petitioner was the highest bidder.

Mr.Pankaj Kundra, Advocate, for Mr. Deepak Sabharwal, Advocate for the respondent-HSVP appears on having advance copy and prays for time to file short affidavit as to what was the reason(s) which prevailed for rejecting the highest bid.

List on 02.11.2023.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case (s)”.

Concededly, the respondent authorities have failed to comply with the order extracted above, as the necessary affidavit has not been furnished. However, learned counsel for the respondent-HSVP submits that let these petitions be disposed of, at this stage, so as to enable the authorities to examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioners, as raised in the petitions and pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law. Further, he submits that petitioners would also be afforded opportunity of hearing before any such orders are passed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners are in agreement with the course suggested by the learned counsel for the respondent-HSVP, and

submit that let all these petitions be disposed of, at this stage, in view of the statement made by learned counsel for the respondent. However, the authorities be directed to pass the necessary orders within a specified time.

The petitions are accordingly disposed of, in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties.

This Court is sanguine that the authorities shall examine the matter in the right earnest. And, appropriate orders, in accordance with law, shall be passed within four weeks from today, assigning reasons in support thereof. And, as undertaken by learned counsel for the respondents, the petitioners shall be afforded an opportunity of hearing, before passing such orders. For the matter is not being decided on merits, all the questions raised by the petitioners are kept open to be examined, if the occasion so arises, in any subsequent proceedings.

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

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

02.11.2023
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No