



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

**CWP No.26380 of 2024
Date of Decision: 15.10.2024.**

Naresh Dhingra and others

....Petitioners

Versus

Haryana Agriculture Marketing Board, Panchkula and others

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. S.P. Arora, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. A.G., Haryana with
Mr. Karan Jindal, Advocate for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate with
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate and
Ms. Saanvi Singla, Advocate for respondents No.3 and 4.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J.

1. The petitioners assail the order dated 12.07.2024 (Annexure P-2) vide which the appeal filed by the petitioners against the order dated 30.03.2021 has been dismissed.
2. The dispute is with regard to preferential allotment of shops/plots in the New Vegetable Market, Hansi to the license-holders functioning in the Old Vegetable Market, Hansi. The petitioners are the legal representatives of one Subhash Chander, who was the sole proprietor of a firm M/s Shree Ganesh Company and was a licensee of Category-II in the Old Vegetable Market, Hansi. Upon the Old Vegetable Market having been de-notified and a New Vegetable Market having been set up, the claim

of the firm of Subhash Chander for allotment of a preferential plot was rejected by the Allotment Committee vide order dated 07.09.2020 (Annexure P-9). In appeal, the matter was remanded for a fresh decision where after, again, vide order dated 30.03.2021, the claim of Subhash Chander was rejected. Aggrieved by the same, an appeal was preferred which was dismissed on 12.07.2024 (Annexure P-2) leading to the filing of the preset petition.

3. At the outset, Sh. Ankur Mittal, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, who is present on advance copy having been served submits that against the order under challenge, a revision petition would be maintainable and that without exhausting the said remedy, the petitioners have instituted the present writ petition.

4. To this, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the remedy of revision is not an efficacious remedy for, if instituted, the revision petition may not be decided for years to come.

5. In response, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana submits that in case the petitioners prefer a revision petition against the order passed in appeal, the same shall be decided within a period of three months.

6. Faced with the aforesaid situation, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners shall prefer a revision petition against the impugned order within a period of one week from today and the same be decided within a period of three months, as has been stated by the learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

7. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties binding them to the same.

This Court is sanguine that in case the petitioners prefer a revision petition

against the order dated 12.07.2024 (communicated on 02.08.2024) within a period of one week from today, the authority concerned shall decide the said revision petition in accordance with law within a further period of three months.

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 petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

October 15, 2024
Rekha

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