



CWP-18745-2026

-1-

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

(108)

CWP-18745-2026

Date of Decision: - 01.07.2026

Satpal

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present:- Mr. Jayant Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 4-HSVP.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for direction to the respondents for allotment of plot measuring 6 marla to the petitioner as per his entitlement in lieu of his acquired and utilized land under the oustee quota in pursuance of his oustee application (Annexure P-13) and further writ in the nature of mandamus for direction to the respondents to consider the share of the petitioner being 35.55 sq. yard in the utilized land by the respondents measuring 237.413 sq. yard as part of acquisition and considering the same for allotment of plot under oustee quota.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the case of the petitioner, the petitioner was covered under the relevant policy on the date he moved an application dated 18.12.2018 (Annexure P-13) for allotment of 6 marlas plot in the oustee quota. It is further submitted that the said application was submitted on 18.12.2018 but till date no order on the same has been communicated to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondents No.2 to 4, on advance notice given, has submitted that the application dated 18.12.2018 filed by the petitioner had already been considered by the Zonal Oustees Screening Committee, who had rejected the same on account of the fact that 75% of the land of the petitioner has not been acquired.

4. On a pointed query raised by this Court, learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4 has fairly submitted that the said order was passed without hearing the petitioner or his representative and has further submitted that there is nothing on record to suggest that the order has been communicated to the petitioner. It is further fairly submitted that the Committee would have no objection to give a hearing to the petitioner or his representative and would also consider any written submissions if made by the petitioner in order to substantiate the fact that more than 75% of his entire land holding has been acquired or that his case is covered under any of the policies.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has no objection to the said course of action.

6. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances and



the fair stand taken on behalf of the petitioner as well as the respondents, the present writ petition is disposed of with the following directions/observations: -

- (i) The Zonal Oustees Screening Committee headed by respondent No.3 would issue a notice to the present petitioner for granting an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner on a specific date and specific time for consideration of the application dated 18.12.2018 (Annexure P-13).
- (ii) It would be open to the petitioner to represent the case himself or through an authorized representative and would also be open to the petitioner to submit a representation along with supported documents to show that his case is covered under any of the relevant policies.
- (iii) In case the petitioner appears on the date so given or any other date which is mutually decided and submits the written representation along with documents, then, the said Zonal Oustees Screening Committee would consider the same and after considering the same would pass a speaking order within a period of two months from the date on which the hearing in the case concludes. The notice for hearing would be given to the petitioner within a period of one month from today by the said Committee.
- (iv) In case the Committee is of the opinion that the plea raised

**CWP-18745-2026****-4-**

by the petitioner is meritorious, then, the necessary relief should also be granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible.

- (v) This Court has not opined on the merits of the application dated 18.12.2018 (Annexure P-13) and the said Committee would consider the same in accordance with law and decide independently.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

July 01, 2026
naresh.k

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes
Whether reportable?	No