



\$~7

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 10463/2024**

DHARAM PAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Ujala Vishnoi and Mr. Randeep Singh, Advocates.

versus

GOVT OF NCT DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rishikesh Kumar, ASC with Ms. Sheenu Priya, Mr. Atik Gill, Mr. Sudhir Kumar Shukla, Mr. Sudhir and Ms. Sabina, Advocates for GNCTD. Mr. R. K. Dhawan, Standing Counsel with Ms. Nisha Dhawan, Mr. V. K. Teng and Ms. Shivani Taneja, Advocates for R-3/ DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

20.08.2024

%

1. The Petitioner contends that due to insurgency in Punjab, like many other families, Petitioner along with his family migrated to Delhi and took shelter in Govind Puri relief camp set up by Government of NCT of Delhi/Respondent No.1.
2. Petitioner's contention is that they are entitled to the benefit of Housing Scheme for Rehabilitation of Punjab Migrants,¹ which was

¹ "HSRPM"



introduced as per recommendation of NHRC, to rehabilitate the migrants of Punjab. To support this claim, Petitioner contends that his name finds a mention in the list of Punjab migrants who were receiving financial support from Respondent No. 1. It is further contended that Respondent No.2, has however, arbitrarily declined to recommend the name of Petitioner for allotment of accommodation under HSRPM scheme. Aggrieved by the same, the Petitioner has filed the present petition.

3. Additionally, the Petitioner references W.P.(C) 5644/2015, filed by similarly situated migrants whose names were not recommended for flat allotment under the HSRPM scheme. In that case, the court, by order dated 28th January 2016, directed the Respondents to treat the writ petition as a representation and determine the status of the Petitioners by issuing a reasoned order.

4. Counsel representing SDM/Respondent No.2 states that they have received a representation dated 20th February, 2024 from Petitioner which is currently under active consideration and shall be decided in an expeditious manner.

5. Ms. Ujala Vishnoi, counsel for Petitioner, states that she would be satisfied with directions to that effect, provided the Respondents are bound to strict timelines for deciding the representation.

6. In light of the above, without going into the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to Respondents No. 1 and 2 to decide Petitioner's representation dated 20th February, 2024 within three months from today. The Petitioner shall also be granted a personal hearing with the time and date to be communicated in advance to the Petitioner.

7. Disposed of.



8. All rights and contentions of parties are left open. The Court has not examined the merits of the case.

AUGUST 20, 2024
d.negi

SANJEEV NARULA, J