

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

120

CWP No.20255 of 2024
Date of decision: 16.10.2024

Transport Nagar Mistry Kalyan Sangathan and othersPetitioners

V/s

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

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

Present: Mr. Munfaid Khan, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate, for the respondents-HSVP.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J.

1 The petitioners claim to be mechanics of transport vehicles carrying out works viz. electrical work, mechanical work, denting and painting work, repairing of tanks, repairing of vehicle body etc. It is their case that a Transport Nagar was developed in Sector-58, Faridabad by the respondents and all mechanical workers in the entire Faridabad city were called upon to carry out their works in the said transport nagar with an oral assurance that permanent shops would be allotted to them at the reserve price. They claim to have been working in the transport nagar in Sector-58, Faridabad for the last 18-20 years. They pray for the issuance of a mandamus directing the respondents to allot shops to the petitioners at the reserve price as per policy to enable them to continue with their avocation. They also seek cancellation of allotment of shops to transport owners on account of the requirement of the petitioners being more than transport owners to continue their work in transport nagar.

despite various representations (Annexures P-1, P-3 to P-5, P-7 and P-8), the authorities have not bothered to act upon the same and have not even bothered to give any response. He submits that on account of the same, the interests of the petitioners continue to suffer.

3. Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, learned counsel representing the respondents (Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran) refers to the written statement filed in Court today, to submit that the earlier policy dated 24.03.2009 has been scrapped and the policy dated 11.08.2016 (Annexure R-1) is now in force. He submits that the case of the petitioners is to be considered in terms of the said policy. He further submits that, in any case, the authorities shall pass a speaking order on the representation/s submitted by the petitioners, one of which has also been annexed as Annexure R-2 with the written statement and shall consider the matter in the right earnest.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners is agreeable to the course suggested by learned counsel representing the respondents. He, however, submits that the decision on the representation/s be taken within a fixed time frame.

5. To this, learned counsel for the respondent-HSVP submits that the speaking order on the representation/s submitted by the petitioners shall be passed within a period of eight weeks from today.

6. Learned counsel for the parties are, therefore, *ad idem* that the writ petition be disposed of in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. In view of the aforesaid, the writ petition is disposed of in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties binding them to the

8. This Court is sanguine that the authority concerned shall pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law, after complying with the principles of natural justice, within the time indicated by learned counsel for the respondents, assigning reasons in support thereof.

9. Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute an expression of opinion on the merits of the case of either party, for, as indicated above, the authority concerned shall examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioners, strictly in accordance with law.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

October 16, 2024
vcgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No