

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

1.

CWP-15798-2010(O&M)
Date of decision: 14.02.2024

Industrial Promotion Welfare Association (Regd.)
... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others
... Respondents

2.

CWP-12488-2015(O&M)

Sonia Malik
... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others
... Respondents

3.

CWP-8483-2020(O&M)

Sanjay Batra and others
... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others
... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. AG, Haryana, and
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate,
for the respondent(s)-State; and
for the respondent(s)-HSIIDC.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

For the matter in issue in this bunch of 3 petitions is identical, the same are being disposed of by a common order and judgment. However, the facts are being derived from CWP-15798-2010 [**Industrial Promotion Welfare Association (Regd.) v. State of Haryana and others**].

Pursuant to an advertisement issued in the year 2006, the industrial sites/plots in Industrial Estate, Karnal were sought to be allotted by

the respondent- Corporation. 50 plots/sites were to be allotted in the General Category, whereas 49 plots were earmarked for allotment under Agriculture Implement Park category. The last date to submit the applications was August 31, 2006. The total applications received by the respondent-Corporation were 279. The interviews of the applicants aspiring for allotment were conducted in August, 2007, pursuant where to 67 applicants were found to be eligible in General Category. And out of 212 applicants, who were declared ineligible in the said category, 41 formed an Association to assail the allotment process. Resultantly, after three years of the interviews, Civil Writ Petition No.1665 of 2010 was filed before this Court. Which was dismissed as withdrawn by the petitioner(s) on 02.02.2010, with liberty to file a comprehensive representation before the respondents. It is not in dispute that subsequently the representation dated 23.02.2010, submitted by the petitioner(s), was rejected on 25.08.2010, which led to filing of the petition at hand. The records show that this petition is pending post admission since May 17, 2013, and in the interregnum, most of the members of the Association have even participated in the subsequent process of allotment. Not just that, the orders passed by this Court from time to time show that petitioners gave up their claim qua most of the successful allottees, who were arrayed as respondents. *Ex facie*, nearly 2 decades have gone by post issuance of the advertisement, referred to above.

In the wake of the position sketched out above, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) fairly submits that none on behalf of the petitioner(s) has contacted his office for the past several years, to ascertain the status of the petition(s) or pursue the same. Therefore, he submits that it would be expedient if the petitions are disposed of having lost its efficacy rather than keeping them pending indefinitely. However, he submits that in case any cause of action,

dispute or interest still survives, liberty be granted to the petitioner(s) to move appropriate application for restoration of the petition(s) and its decision on merits.

The prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) is not opposed.

Accordingly, the petitions are disposed of in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s).

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

14.02.2024
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES/NO
Whether Reportable:	YES/NO