



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

203

CWP-32654-2019

Date of decision: 22.05.2024

ASMA

...PETITIONER

Vs.

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Vikrant Koundal, Advocate for
Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate
for the respondents.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through the instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of E-mail dated 03.06.2019 (Annexure P-6) sent by respondents whereby candidature of the petitioner has been rejected.

2. On 16.11.2023, the following order was passed:

“The candidature of the petitioner has been rejected as land offered by the petitioner falls within KM Stone 79 to 80 whereas advertised site was KM Stone 75 to 78 (LHS) Gurgaon Alwar Road, RHS, NH-248A.

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks short accommodation to verify whether petitioner is able to offer alternative land on the advertised site. Till date no allotment has been made.

Adjourned to 24.11.2023.”



CWP-32654-2019

-2-

3. On 24.11.2023, the following was passed:
*“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is having land which falls within advertised site.
On the asking of Court, he submits that requisite papers would be produced on the next date of hearing.
Adjourned to 30.11.2023.”*
4. Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate submits that till date, the petitioner has not offered alternative land within the advertised site. He submits that land on the advertised site is very costly and petitioner in any case would not be able to offer alternative land.
5. The petitioner was extended sufficient opportunity still she has failed to offer alternative land. The site in question was advertised in 2018, thus, in any case, it may not be just and fair to ask the respondent to accept alternative land.
6. Dismissed.

22.05.2024
manoj

[JAGMOHAN BANSAL]
JUDGE

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