



CWP-22451-2024

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-22451-2024

Date of decision: 06.09.2024

Om Pati

....Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RITU TAGORE**

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Patial, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaivir S. Chandail, Additional Standing Counsel, and
Ms. Sukhmani Patwalia, Advocate,
for the respondents-U.T., Chandigarh.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

We had heard learned counsel for the parties at length, when during the course of hearing, they have reached a consensus: the impugned order dated 21.09.2023 (P-17), passed by the Assistant Estate Officer, for Estate Officer, U.T., Chandigarh, is appealable under clause 17 of the Chandigarh Small Flats Scheme, 2006. Therefore, it is agreed that in the given circumstances and for conclusive determination of the *lis* between the parties, it would be expedient if the petitioner is relegated to avail the remedy of appeal, in the first instance.

Accordingly, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner shall file the appeal, in terms of the said clause, at the earliest.

To which, learned counsel for the respondents fairly submits that in the event, any such appeal is filed, the Appellate Authority shall take cognizance thereof and proceed therewith, in accordance with law.

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.



Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion on the merits of the case of either party, for, as indicated earlier, the competent authority shall examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(RITU TAGORE)
JUDGE

06.09.2024
Ak Sharma

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