



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-16683-2023(O&M)
Date of decision: 22.11.2024

Kavi Raj Sharma ... Petitioner
Versus
Haryana Sehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) and another ... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, Advocate, and
Mr. Nipun Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate,
for the respondents-HSVP.
...

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the suit filed by the petitioner (plaintiff) seeking allotment of a suitable site/plot under the oustees quota was dismissed by the trial Court. Whereafter, in appeal, the decree was reversed and the suit was decreed as prayed for. And, the said judgment has since been modified by this Court while disposing of Regular Second Appeal No.858 of 2011, preferred by the respondent-authorities, in terms of the decision rendered by the Division Bench, in **Haryana Urban Development Authority and others v. Sandeep and others**, 2012(2) Law Herald (P&H) 1550. Further, even the Special Leave Petition (C) No.27256-27264-2012 (P-6) preferred by the respondent(s), assailing the decision in **Sandeep’s case**, has since been dismissed by the Supreme Court.

That being so, learned counsel for the petitioner, as always, fairly submits that the remedy available to the petitioner for redressal of his



grievance is to move the Executing Court, for seeking execution of the decree passed in his favour. As also, if so advised, move the requisite application in response to the fresh advertisement as and when the same would be issued by the respondent-State, for consideration of his claim.

In the wake of the position sketched out above, and in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties, the petition is accordingly disposed of.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

22.11.2024
Rajan

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