



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-34902-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 20.12.2024

Ramesh Yadav ... Petitioner
Versus
Haryana Urban Development Authority and others ... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Abhishek Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate,
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate, and
Ms. Saanvi Singla, Advocate, for the respondents.
...

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner (Ramesh Yadav) has prayed for the following substantive relief:

“Civil Writ Petition under Articles 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to allot residential/commercial site plot in the name of the petitioner in view of acquisition of their land vide notification No.LAC(G)NTLA/2008/ 1470 Annexure P-1 dated 25.11.2008 under Section 4 of Land Acquisition Act, the respondents had acquired the land in question for the development. Further followed by another notification no.LAC(G)NTLA/ 2009/1489 Annexure P-1 dated 07.01.2009 under Section 6 of Land Acquisition Act, under Oustees quota in view of notification Annexure P-3 dated 09.11.2010 of Government of Haryana and other policies of State Government or Haryana Urban Development Authority as per the settled law.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that prior to the institution of this petition, the petitioner had even served the respondent-



authorities with a legal notice dated July 10, 2024 (P-5), as regards his concerns/grievances, but to no avail.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Ankur Mittal, 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 legal notice/representation (**ibid**) alleged to have been served by the petitioner, 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 petitioner. And pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law. Further, he submits that before any such orders are passed, the petitioner through his authorized representative shall be heard, for which a formal communication would be issued, well in advance.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is agreeable to the course suggested by learned counsel for the respondents. However, he submits that 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 petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

20.12.2024
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO