

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No. 7744 of 2024
Date of decision: 10.04.2024

Lalit Kumar Jindal Petitioner

Vs.

Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure
Development Corporation Ltd. and others + Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Sumeet Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J (Oral)

The petitioner has prayed for the following substantive relief:

“Civil Writ Petition under article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ in the nature of certiorari or any other appropriate order or direction for quashing impugned order dated 16.02.2024 passed by Respondent No.1 (Annexure P-20) whereby request for mutation of Plot no.118, Rojka Meo, Tehsil Nuh, District Mewat (Haryana) in favour of petitioner has been subjected to arbitrary condition by passing illegal and perverse order;

For issuance of a Writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent No.1 to mutate Plot no.118, Rojka Meo, Tehsil Nuh, District Mewat (Haryana) in name of the petitioner which was purchased in auction sale conducted by the Respondent No.2 and directing the respondent No.1 not to demand Occupation Certificate (OC), sanctioned building plans of the said plot and execution of a fresh agreement.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that apparently, the impugned order dated 16.02.2024, vide which the plot/site in question has

been transferred/mutated in the name of the petitioner, subject, however, to certain conditions is arbitrary and unsustainable.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate with Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate is present in Court on behalf of the respondents-HSIIDC. He submits that the grievance of the petitioner is totally misconceived as the **conditions**, subject to which the site/plot in question has been mutated in the name of the petitioner, is the standard operating procedure that is followed by the respondent authorities.

We had heard the matter at some length, when during the course of hearing, learned counsel for the parties have reached a consensus: let this petition be disposed of, with liberty to the petitioner to move the competent authority as regards his concerns/grievances, if any. And, if within a week from today, the petitioner submits any representation, the same shall be taken cognizance of and appropriate orders, in accordance with law, shall be passed within four weeks thereafter. Further, before any such orders are passed, the petitioner would also be afforded an opportunity of hearing, and formal communication in this regard shall be issued to him.

In the wake of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties, the petition is accordingly disposed of.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

10.04.2024
deepak

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