



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CWP-30816-2024(O&M)  
Date of decision: 09.12.2024

Bimla Devi ... Petitioner  
Versus  
State of Haryana and others ... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Pankaj Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
Mr. Vaneet Soni, Advocate, for  
Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate, for the respondent-HSVP.  
...

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has prayed for the following substantive relief:

“Petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondents to consider the Petitioner's rightful claim for the allotment of a residential plot under the Oustees Quota, as per their advertisement for the Oustee scheme, which was issued vide Memo No. Admn/A-1/2018/12249 (Annexure P-7, dated 03.09.2018). The Respondents communicated to Petitioner's son when he attended the hearing at Respondent No. 4 office on 02.08.2024 that Petitioner's claim has been rejected because she had applied for a plot size that was not advertised. However, the Respondents themselves had earlier declared the Petitioner eligible for the allotment of a 1 Kanal plot in Sector-51, Gurgram as reflected in the list issued on 24.09.2020 (Annexure P-9, dated 24.09.2020).

AND/OR issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing Respondents to maintain equity amongst the



**fellow Oustees who had made applications pursuant to the advertisement of the Oustee scheme which was made vide Memo No. Admn/A-1/2018/12249 (Annexure P-7, dated 03.09.2018) and allot her the plot as they have allotted to the petitioners of COCP 296 of 2021 and COCP 261 of 2022 as there is no difference in the credentials of those who have been allotted plot under Oustee Quota and Petitioner.**

**AND/OR issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing Respondents to clarify the rates of plot which are proposed to allotted to the Oustees in pursuance to their own policy (Annexure P-6, dated 08.05.2018) which categorically says that price of the plot which is to be given to allottee should be mentioned in such advertisement and same is missing in advertisement of Oustee scheme which was made vide Memo No. Admn/A-1/2018/12249 (Annexure P-7, dated 03.09.2018).**

**AND/OR issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing Respondents not to hold any draw for Oustees pursuant to the Oustee scheme (Annexure P-7, dated 03.09.2018) till the adjudication of Oustees claim of Petitioner by this Hon'ble Court.”**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is the erstwhile landowner, whose land-holding was acquired by the State Government for a public purpose. Accordingly, in terms of the prevalent policy/scheme(s), the petitioner is entitled to be allotted a suitable site/plot, per her entitlement. It is urged that the petitioner had, indeed, moved application in this regard years ago, which was even processed, but, the matter has not made any tangible progress to date. Thus, this petition.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Vaneet Soni, Advocate, for the respondent-HSVP, is present in Court. At the outset, he, on instructions, submits that initially, claim of the petitioner, along with 128 others, was rejected. However, the competent authority, vide a conscious



decision dated 25.11.2024, has directed the Zonal Scrutiny Committee to re-consider the claim of the petitioner and alike, for allotment. He, as always, fairly submits that the said exercise is already underway and would be concluded within a week from today. Whereafter, the draw of lots would be held within next two weeks. Further, those who are found eligible, in terms of the scheme, their names would be included in the draw of lots. Needless to assert, he submits, in the event the petitioner is found eligible, she would be allotted a suitable plot/site, per her entitlement.

That being so, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that nothing substantive survives in the petition and the same be disposed of, in terms of the statement made by learned counsel for the respondent-HSVP.

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.

( Arun Palli )  
Judge

( Vikram Aggarwal )  
Judge

09.12.2024  
Rajan

|                              |        |
|------------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking / reasoned: | YES/NO |
| Whether Reportable:          | YES/NO |