

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

CWP-1258-2024

Date of decision: 20.01.2024

Manpreet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

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

Present: Ms. Jaspreet Kaur, Advocate, for
Mr. Mohit Jaggi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to a scheme launched by the respondent-Greater Mohali Area Development Authority (GMADA), for allotment of residential apartments at Purab Premium Apartments, Sector 88, SAS Nagar (Mohali), the petitioner, vide application No.397, applied for allotment of a flat in the said scheme. And, even he was declared successful in the draw of lots held by respondent-GMADA qua flat No.1001 (9th floor), Category General, Block-D, Tower No.3. However, soon thereafter, vide application dated 27.10.2023, the petitioner prayed for cancellation of his claim for any such allotment, for the reasons cited therein, but the same was not accepted. She further submits that whereafter, vide application/representation dated 07.11.2023 (P-6), the petitioner again required the authorities to take cognizance of his concerns/grievances and refund the amount he had deposited, after deducting 1% of the said amount. It is urged that even though a considerable time has elapsed, but the matter has not made any tangible progress. As a result, interest of the petitioner continues to suffer.

Served with the advance copy of the petition,
Mr. V.G. Jauhar, learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab, and

Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate, for the respondent-GMADA, are present in Court.

At the outset, learned counsel for the respondent-GMADA submits that as the competent authority is already in seisin of the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, it would be expedient, if the petition at hand is disposed of, at this stage, to enable it to deal therewith, and pass necessary orders on the representation submitted by the petitioner, in accordance with law. Further, he submits that before any such orders are passed, the petitioner would also be afforded a hearing.

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

In response, learned counsel for the respondent-GMADA submits that appropriate orders shall be passed 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.

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

20.01.2024
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No