

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CWP-9898-2017
Decided on :20.01.2024

Chain Lal

. . . Petitioner

Versus

House Allotment Committee, Chandigarh and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Ms. Vaishali Thakur, Advocate for
Mr. Vivek Thakur, Advocate
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 Muncial Corporation, Panchkula.

Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate
for respondent No. 7.

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 certiorari for quashing the impugned order dated 02.05.2017 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent No. 2 whereby the request for allotment of another house has been declined.

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 main concern is that house is being allotted to a government employee under The Government Residence Allotment Rules, 1996 until and unless it is in a liveable condition as certified by the Junior Engineer, Incharge of a particular allotted house and also, with regard to allotment of houses, there is no pick and choose policy inasmuch as, the allotments are governed by an online portal namely E-Awas PORTAL and an eligible employee can bid/apply online for the accommodation that he wishes to get. It is further submitted that every possible effort has been made to make the allotment transparent and 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 met.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel appearing for the other parties are satisfied with the stand of respondent No. 1 and have submitted that the present petition be disposed of having been rendered infructuous.
5. In view of the above, present petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

20.01.2024
Mehak

<i>Whether reasoned/speaking?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>