



CWP-30706-2024

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-30706-2024Date of decision: 14.11.2024

Satya Narain

....Petitioner

Versus

Chief Administrator, Haryana Urban Development Authority, and
another

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Jagjeet Beniwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner (Satya Narain) is an erstwhile landowner, whose holding was acquired by the State Government for a public purpose. Thus, he prays for the following substantive relief:-

“Civil Writ Petition under articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to allot a residential plot under Oustees Policy as the land of the petitioner has been acquired for development residential Sector 21-A, Rohtak.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that prior to the institution of this petition, the petitioner had repeatedly served the respondent authorities with numerous representations, as also legal notice dated 06.08.2024 (P-8), as regards his concerns/grievances. However, he submits, though a considerable time has elapsed, but the matter has not made any tangible progress. Hence, this petition.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate, for the respondent-HSVP, is present in Court. At



the outset, he vehemently disputes the claim of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner failed to move the necessary application for allotment of a suitable site/plot, in response to the advertisements that were issued in the past. He submits that the claim of the petitioner can only be addressed, as and when a fresh advertisement is issued. In this regard, he informs the Court that the authorities, in its 127th meeting, held on 08.11.2024, have taken certain vital decisions to address the claim of the oustees across the State of Haryana. Further, soon after the necessary formalities are carried out, a fresh advertisement would be issued. And, at any rate, the petitioner would also be at liberty to respond to the said advertisement for allotment, per his entitlement/eligibility. Be that as it may, he submits, for the competent authority is alleged to be in seisin of the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, it would rather be expedient if the petition is disposed of, at this stage, to enable the respondent authorities to consider and pass necessary orders on the legal notice (*ibid*), in accordance with law. Further, before any such orders are passed, the petitioner shall be heard, for which, a formal communication shall be issued to him, well in advance.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is in agreement with the course suggested by learned counsel for the respondents, 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 respondents submits that appropriate orders shall be passed within a period of four weeks from today.

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.

This Court is sanguine that the authorities shall look into the matter in the right earnest. And the appropriate orders, assigning reasons in support thereof, shall be passed within the time indicated by the learned counsel for the respondents.



CWP-30706-2024

-3-

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

14.11.2024
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No