

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(210)

CWP-7089-1996

Date of decision: - 30.01.2024

Mukesh Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Ankit Rana, Advocate
for Mr. Pardeep Solath, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ of certiorari to set aside the order dated 19.05.1995 (Annexure P-2) and dated 13.03.1996 (Annexure P-8), with a further prayer for directing the respondents to allot a government house to the petitioner.

2. Learned State counsel has pointed out that as per order dated 16.05.2022 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the petitioner as per his own instructions, has vacated the government accommodation on 01.09.1997 and thus, the present writ petition has been rendered infructuous.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that although, the main prayer has already been resolved, yet there are certain deductions which have been made by the respondents, which are not in accordance with law, thus, the petitioner states that he be permitted to give a detailed representation with respect to the said prayer and the competent authority of respondent No.1-State be directed to grant the same in accordance with law within a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous with respect to the main prayer.

5. It would be open to the petitioner to move a representation with respect to the grievances which have been raised by him on 16.05.2022 and other grievances to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State and in case any such representation is given by the petitioner, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the same within a period of six weeks from the date of submission of the said representation and in case after considering the said representation, competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to him as expeditiously as possible. In case the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of six weeks.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

January 30, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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