

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

CWP-25174-2022

Date of decision: 23.01.2024

Smt. Bimla

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

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

**Present:** Mr. Rahul Vohra, Advocate, for  
Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate,  
for the respondent-HSVP.

\*\*\*\*

**ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner participated in the e-auction conducted by the respondent-HSVP, for allotment of a residential site/plot No.1129, Sector-39, Urban Estate, Gurugram-II. He submits that being adjudged H1 and ready to abide by the terms of the auction, she was sanguine that a letter of intent would follow in a due course. It is not in dispute either that she had deposited Rs.43,39,750/- (10% of the sale consideration). He submits that the limited grievance the petitioner has is: on the web portal of the respondent-authorities, status of the site in question is shown as cancelled. However, neither the petitioner was served with any show cause notice, nor she was afforded any hearing before cancellation of the proposed allotment by the authorities. He asserts that no order, in this regard, was communicated to the petitioner either. So much so, even the representation dated 26.08.2022 (P-5), the authorities were served with, has failed to evoke any response. It is urged that a considerable time has elapsed since then, but the matter has not made any tangible progress. Thus, rights/interest of the petitioner are seriously marred and she continues to suffer.

As opposed to this, learned counsel for the respondent-HSVP controverts the claim of the petitioner and submits that even a

formal written statement on behalf of the respondent authorities has since been filed. Be that as it may, he submits that since the competent authority is already in seisin of the representation of the petitioner, it would be expedient if the petition is disposed of, at this stage, to enable the respondents to deal with the concerns/grievances, and pass necessary orders, in accordance with law. Further, he submits that before any such orders are passed, the petitioner shall also be afforded a hearing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is in agreement with the course suggested by the learned counsel for the respondent-HSVP, and submits that let this petition be disposed of, in terms of the statement made by him. However, it is urged that the authorities be directed to do the needful within a specified time.

In response, learned counsel for the respondent-HSVP submits that appropriate orders shall be passed within a period of eight weeks from today.

The petition is accordingly disposed of, in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties.

This Court is sanguine that the authorities shall look into the matter in the right earnest. And the appropriate orders shall be passed within the time indicated by the learned counsel for the respondent.

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 above, the competent authority shall examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(ARUN PALLI)  
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)  
JUDGE

23.01.2024  
Ak Sharma

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |