



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-34961-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 20.12.2024

Krishan and others ... Petitioners
Versus
Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) and others ... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Ankit Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioners.
Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate,
for the respondents.
...

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have prayed for the following substantive relief:

“Civil Writ Petition under Articles 226/227 of the
Constitution of India thereby praying for the issuance
of a writ in the nature of Mandamus thereby directing
the respondent authority to complete the process of
allotment of commercial sites in Sector-21 Part
(Commercial), Rohtak for rehabilitation/ shifting of
Kath Mandi, Rohtak for which the applications were
invited from the petitioners vide public notice
(Annexure P-1);

AND

For the issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus
thereby directing the respondent authority to decide
the representation dated 21.10.2024 (Annexure P-5)
within some stipulated time period.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that prior to the
institution of this petition, the petitioners had even served the respondent-
authorities with a representation dated October 21, 2024 (P-5), as regards their
concerns/grievances, but to no avail.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Deepak
Sabherwal, Advocate, is present in Court on behalf of the respondents. At the

outset, he, on instructions, submits that since the respondent-authorities are already in *seisin* of the representation (**ibid**) alleged to have been served by the petitioners, it shall be expedient if this petition is disposed of, at this stage, to enable the competent authority to consider the concerns/grievances of the petitioners. And pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law. Further, he submits that before any such orders are passed, the petitioners through their authorized representative shall be heard, for which a formal communication would be issued, well in advance.

Learned counsel for the petitioners is agreeable to the course suggested by learned counsel for the respondents. However, he submits, for a considerable time has elapsed, the authorities be directed to take a decision within a specified time.

In response, learned counsel for the respondents submits that necessary orders shall be passed within a period of 8 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 stands disposed of. This Court is sanguine that the respondent-authorities shall consider the matter in the right earnest, and pass the appropriate orders within the time indicated by learned counsel for the respondents.

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 petitioners, strictly in accordance with law.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

20.12.2024
Rajan

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