

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-6417-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 18.03.2024

Veerpal Singh and another
... Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab and others
... Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Sunil K. Dixit, Advocate,
for the petitioners.
Mr. Jastej Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab,
for the respondents.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have prayed for the following substantive relief:

“Civil Writ Petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, 1950 for the issuance of any writ, order or mandate especially in the nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned order dated 01.09.2023 (Annexure P-17) passed by respondent no.2 with further request for issuance of appropriate directions to the respondent no.3 to issue Allotment Letter in favour of the petitioners in respect of Residential Plot No.2130, Sector 68, SAS Nagar (Mohali) measuring 125 Sq. Yards (5 Marlas), allotted to their father Gurpreet Singh son of Ranjit Singh in furtherance to the Letter of Intent No.13055 dated 28.12.2001, at the rate of Rs.3328/- per Sq. Yards, applied for way back in the year 2001 and consequent thereupon to hand over the vacant physical possession of the said plot to the petitioners, so as to enable them to construct the said plot for their livelihood.”

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Jastej Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, is present in Court on behalf of the respondents.

At the outset, he submits that dehors of the impugned order dated September 1, 2023 (P-17), passed by the Chief Administrator, GMADA (respondent No.2), for the competent authority is already in *seisin* of the representation dated 06.07.2020 (P-14), as also the legal notice dated 11.04.2022 (P-15) the petitioners alleged to have served the respondent-authorities with, let this petition be disposed of, at this stage, to enable the competent authority to consider the same, and pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law.

Learned counsel for the petitioners is agreeable to the course suggested by learned State counsel. And submits, let this petition be disposed of in terms of his statement. However, he submits that as the matter is pending for a considerable time, the competent authority be directed to take a decision within a specified time.

To which, learned State counsel submits that the necessary orders shall be passed within a period of eight weeks from today.

In the wake of the position sketched out above, and in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties, the petition stands disposed of. This Court is sanguine that the competent authority shall consider the matter in the right earnest, and pass the necessary orders.

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 petitioners, strictly in accordance with law.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

18.03.2024
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO