

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CWP-10381-2017

Decided on :20.01.2024

Rajiv

. . . Petitioner

Versus

House Allotment Committee, Chandigarh and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikram Prakash, Advocate for
Mr. S. P. Arora, Advocate, Amicus Curiae.

Mr. Anil Mehta, Senior Standing Counsel with
Mr. Jaivir Chandail, Additional Standing Counsel with
Ms. Jyoti Kumari, Advocate
for UT, Chandigarh.

Ms. Savita Saxena, Advocate
for Punjab and Haryana High Court.

Ms. Suman Jain, Advocate and
Mr. Rishabh Jain, Advocate
for Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh.

Mr. Vicky Chauhan, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate
for Municipal Corporation, Panchkula.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. Present Civil Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to consider the request of the petitioner and handover the vacant possession of the house Type-1 (New) No. 4252, 1st Floor, Sector-46, Chandigarh allotted to the petitioner vide allotment letter dated 14/15.02.2017 (Annexure P-2).

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No. 1 has submitted that the petitioner has been allotted the government house and

is satisfied with the same. It is further submitted that the concern of the allottees has been met with inasmuch as the respondent No. 1 has taken a decision that a house to be allotted to a government employee under the Government Residence Allotment Rules, 1996 would only be allotted if the same is in a liveable condition which fact has to be certified by the Junior Engineer, Incharge of the said house and it has further been decided that for allotment of houses, there would be no pick and choose policy inasmuch and the allotments would be governed by an online portal namely E-Awas PORTAL and all eligible employees could apply online for the accommodation that he wishes to get and the same would be allotted by following a transparent procedure, in accordance with The Government Residence Allotment Rules, 1996.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the High Court has submitted that initially the employees of the High Court had certain grievances but the said grievances have been addressed.

4. None has appeared on behalf of the petitioner to rebut the above.

5. Learned counsel for all the parties who have appeared are satisfied with the stand of respondent No. 1 and have submitted that the present petition be disposed of having been rendered infructuous.

6. In view of the above, present petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to move an application for revival of the same in case any cause survives.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

20.01.2024
Mehak

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