

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No. 22622 of 2022
Date of decision: 10.04.2024

The Chandigarh Sector 7, Cooperative House Building
(First) Society Ltd. Petitioner
Vs.
Chandigarh Administration and others Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Iqbal Singh Saggu, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Sanjiv Ghai, Advocate with
Mr. Parminder S. Kaul, Advocate for the respondents No.1, 6 and 7.
Ms. Diya Sodhi, Advocate for the respondents No. 2 to 5.

ARUN PALLI, J (Oral)

At the outset, learned counsel for the Chandigarh Administration has placed before us a communication dated 15.09.2023, issued by the Chief Administrator, U.T. Chandigarh, to the petitioner, regarding grant of permission of sewerage connection as also the completion/occupation certificate, and submits that so far as the relief claimed against respondents No.1, 6 and 7 is concerned, the same has been rendered infructuous. A photocopy of the communication dated 15.09.2023, is taken on record as “Mark-X”.

However, despite repeated opportunities, no response has been submitted on behalf of Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh. Rather, learned counsel for the respondent-Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, has placed before us a communication dated 29.11.2023, which is taken on record as “Mark-Y”, and submits that let this petition be disposed of, to enable the competent authority to examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, as set out in the petition and pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute that the relief claimed against Chandigarh Administration, in the wake of the communication dated 15.09.2023, has been rendered infructuous. He further submits that let this petition be disposed of in terms of the statement made by the learned counsel for the respondent-Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh.

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

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 earlier, the competent authority shall examine the grievances of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

10.04.2024
deepak

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No