



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

Sr. No.239

COCP- 1629-2023

Date of Decision:11.09.2024

Ravinder Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Ajit Balaji Joshi and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Ajit Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARKESH MANUJA, J.(ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, prayer has been made for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents on account of alleged non-compliance of order dated 16.01.2023 passed by this Court in CWP-572-2023. The order thereof is reproduced hereunder:-

“Learned counsel for respondents No. 2 to 4 has produced an order passed by the Estate Officer, HSVP, Sonapat, wherein the claim of the petitioner has been duly considered and the reasons assigned for nonacceptance of the prayer as has been made.

What has been pointed out and highlighted is that the petitioner did not submit the certificate of Tehsildar regarding legal heirs of the deceased land owners (Ran Singh, Parsanni Devi, Ved Parkash) with complete pedigree table and no objection or affidavit from the legal heirs.

Copy of the said decision dated 13.01.2023 has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the relevant documents, as have been pointed out while rejecting the claim of the petitioner, would be submitted to the Estate Officer, HSVP, Sonapat, within a period of four weeks from today.

**COC-1629-2023****-2-**

In case the said documents, as have been taken to be a ground for non-acceptance of the claim of the petitioner, are submitted by the petitioner within the time, as stated by the counsel for the petitioner, the same shall be considered by the Estate Officer, HSVP, Sonapat and a decision taken thereon with regard to the claim of the petitioner afresh within a period of six weeks of submission of such representation/documents.

Writ petition stands disposed of accordingly.”

2. As a matter of fact, the aforesaid order was assailed by the respondents before the Hon’ble Apex Court, however, SLP came to be dismissed vide order dated 05.07.2023.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in the proceedings dated 14.08.2024 before the Oustees Screening Committee, the petitioner is found entitled for allotment of 01 kanal under the oustees quota, however, he submits that the process of draw of lots and allotment may take some time on account of ensuing legislative assembly election.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book.
5. As per the record, the process of acquiring the land of the petitioner commenced in the year 1992, thereby, making him entitled for allotment of plot under the oustees category, however, the respondents have taken around 32 years to decide his entitlement qua the same, though, the application was made in the year 2011 and from that date almost 13 years has expired, still the actual allotment has not been made in their favour and during the past almost 13 years, the cost of construction has gone sky high. In such, circumstances, the respondents are directed to conclude the aforementioned process of carrying out draw of lots and issuance of

-3-

Disposed of accordingly. Rule stands discharged.

11.09.2024
dinesh

Yes/No
Yes/No