

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

CWP-638-2024

Date of decision: 12.01.2024

Gulshan Rani

....Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) and others Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Vaneet Soni, Advocate,
 for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to the e-auction conducted by the respondent-HSVP on 14.12.2022, petitioner participated in the said auction, for a residential plot No.316, Sector-75, Faridabad (10 marlas). He submits for the petitioner, against the reserve price of Rs.80,10,100/-, submitted a bid for Rs. 88,90,100/-, she was adjudged H1. And, for she was always ready to abide by the terms of the auction and deposit the balance consideration, she was sanguine that she would soon be issued a letter of intent, followed by a regular allotment. However, he submits that respondent authorities instead rejected the bid of the petitioner and refunded the earnest money deposited by her (Rs.4,00,600/-), as also the amount on account of H1 payment (Rs.4,88,410/-). It is urged that to date, neither the respondent authorities have passed any order, nor assigned reasons to justify rejection of the bid of petitioner, despite being H1. So much so, even the representation dated 04.01.2023 (P-5), the respondent authorities have been served with, has failed to evoke any response.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate, for the respondent-HSVP, is present in Court. The factual position, as sketched out above, is not disputed by him. Rather, he concedes that no formal order was passed prior to

rejecting the bid of the petitioner and crediting the amount deposited by her. Further, even the representation submitted by the petitioner has not been responded to. Therefore, it is urged that let this petition be disposed of, at this stage, to enable the competent authority to take cognizance of the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, and pass necessary orders on the representation submitted by her, in accordance with law. He submits that before any such orders are passed, the petitioner, if so required, shall also be afforded a hearing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is in agreement with the course suggested by the learned counsel for the respondent-HSVP, 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 respondent-HSVP submits that the appropriate orders shall be passed within a period of six 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 the appropriate orders shall be passed within the time indicated by the learned counsel for the respondent.

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

12.01.2024
Ak Sharma

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