



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

**CWP No.33692 of 2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision :13.12.2024**

Jai Narayan Saini

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Sourabh Goel, Advocate for the petitioner.

**Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. A.G. Haryana with
Mr. Karan Jindal, AAG, Haryana.**

**Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate with
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate and
Ms. Saanvi Singla, Advocate for HSVP.**

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral):


The petitioner (Jai Narayan Saini) has prayed for the following substantive relief:-

**“Civil Writ Petition under Article 226 of
Constitution of India 1950 interalia praying for issuance a
writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus
directing the respondents to consider and take final decision
on the application dated 3.12.2018, Annexure P-3 for
allotment of a plot under oustees policy dated 11.08.2016
Annexure P-1 in pursuance to the advertisement/public
notice, Annexure P-2 issued in the year 2018 calling upon
applications for allotment of plots under the oustees quota.”**



Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that land measuring 9 kanal 12 marla owned by the petitioner, situated in the revenue estate of village Silokhra, Tehsil Gurugram, was acquired for a public purpose. He submits that in response to the public notice dated 03.09.2018, the petitioner moved the required application dated 03.12.2018, for allotment of a suitable site/plot, per the oustees policy dated 11.08.2016. He asserts, for no allotment followed, the petitioner was compelled to submit representations dated 28.09.2020 and 02.11.2023. But to no avail. And vide communication dated 20.05.2023, the petitioner was informed, for a fresh scrutiny of all the oustees application was in progress, further action would be taken on completion of the said process. It is submitted that years have rolled by, but the claim of the petitioner remains unaddressed.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate, is present in Court for the respondents. At the outset, he, on instructions, submits that initially, the claim of the petitioner along with 128 others was rejected, for, he had actually sought allotment of 8 marla site/plot for which no advertisement was issued by the respondent-authority. Be that as it may, he submits that 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. And the said process at best would be concluded within four weeks from today. Whereafter, it is urged that draw of lots will be held within the next two weeks. And, those who are found eligible, in terms of the scheme, their names would be included in the draw of lots. It is submitted that in the event the petitioner is found eligible he would be allotted a suitable plot/site as per his 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 respondents.

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

13.12.2024
Manoj Bhutani

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