

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-25849-2023

Date of decision:17.11.2023

Sunil Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

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

**Present: Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.**

\*\*\*\*

**ARUN PALLI, J. ( Oral )**

The petitioner herein has prayed for the following substantive relief:

*“Civil Writ Petition under article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned order dated 15.03.2023 (Annexure P-6) whereby the claim of the petitioner has been rejected;*

*AND/OR*

*For issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to allot a plot under oustees quota in Sector-65, Faridabad as per entitlement under HSVP Policy.”*

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in terms of the policy of the State Government, petitioner, being an oustee, had applied for allotment of site/plot. He submits that after years, the authorities have now rejected the claim of the petitioner, vide order dated 15.03.2023 (P-6). Which is apparently unsustainable on multiple grounds.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate, for the respondent-HSVP, is present in Court. He fairly concedes that the competent authority is required to re-visit the

entire matter. Therefore, he submits that let this petition be disposed of, at this stage, to enable the authorities to re-examine the matter and pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law. He submits that if necessary, the petitioner shall also be afforded an opportunity of hearing, before any such orders are passed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is agreeable to the course suggested by the learned counsel for the respondents, and submits that let this petition be disposed of, in terms of the statement made by him. However, it is urged that the authorities be directed to do the needful within a specified time.

In response, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the appropriate orders, in accordance with law, shall be passed within a period of four weeks from today.

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

This Court is sanguine that the authorities shall look into the matter in the right earnest. And, appropriate orders, in accordance with law, shall be passed within the time indicated by the learned counsel for the respondents.

Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute an 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

17.11.2023  
Ak Sharma

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |