

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No. 440 of 2024

Date of decision: 10.01.2024

Mohan Lal

.... Petitioner

Vs.

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran and another

.... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Karan Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate,
for the respondents-HSVP.

ARUN PALLI, J (Oral)

The petitioner herein has prayed for the following substantive relief:

“Civil Writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, for the issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the action of respondent/HSVP to conduct draw of lots of shop at “Shiv Market, Sector 9, Panchkula” as the marked was gutted in fire on 01.09.2022 and the respondents were under an obligation to allot the shop to the shop owners considering the location and shop number of their previous shops while rehabilitating them and further for quashing order dated 08.09.2023 (Annexure P-8) of Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran, Panchkula to an extent shop no.121 has been allotted to the petitioner in Rehri Market, Sector 9, Panchkula which is causing huge financial losses to the petitioner who is running mechanic shop in the market.

AND/OR

Further for issuance of the writ in the nature of mandamus directing the HSVP to allot shop to petitioner at the same place where previous shop of

petitioner was located i.e. shop no.124, Rehri Market, Sector 9, Panchkula in which the petitioner had been running his mechanic shop from a long time.

AND/OR

Further during pendency of the present petition the shop situated at previous location of the petitioner be kept vacant and the possession of the same be not handed over to subsequent allottee.”

At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that prior to the institution of this petition, the petitioner had even served the respondent authorities with a representation dated 09.02.2023 (P-4), which continues to remain pending to the authorities and as a result the interest of the petitioner is severely impaired.

Upon being served with an advance copy of the petition, Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate, for respondents is present in Court. He submits that it would be expedient if this petition is disposed of, to enable the competent authorities, to deal with the concerns/grievances of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders on the representation, in accordance with law. He further submits that necessary orders shall be passed within six weeks from today after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for petitioner is agreeable to the course suggested by the learned counsel for respondents and submits that let this petition be disposed of in view of the statement made by him.

In the wake of the position sketched out above, this petition is accordingly disposed of in terms of the statement made by learned counsel for the parties.

This Court is sanguine that the authorities shall consider/examine the matter in issue, and pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law, within the time indicated by learned counsel for the respondents, assigning reasons in support thereof.

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 earlier, the competent authority shall examine the grievances of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

10.01.2024
deepak

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