



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

CWP-39303-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 25.02.2026

Vinay Suri

...Petitioner

Vs.

**Real Estate Appellate
Tribunal, Punjab and others**

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Ms. Suverna Mutneja, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J.(Oral)

CM-2045-CWP-2026

Application is allowed as prayed for.

Annexures P-16 to P-19 are taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

Main case

The petitioner is seeking a direction to respondent No.2 to take effective action on the complaints/representations dated 16.01.2025 and 04.02.2025 (Annexures P-11 and P-12) filed against respondents No.3 to 7.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had applied for allotment of residential plot and was placed at Sr.No.2 in the waiting list. The petitioner's name was later arbitrarily removed without any

justifiable reason. He had preferred a complaint before RERA Punjab, which was dismissed on 18.02.2022. His appeal was however allowed by the Real Estate Appellate Tribunal, Punjab on 25.07.2022 and respondent No.2 was directed to treat the petitioner as part of the waiting list for one year and consider his case for allotment subject to re-deposit of the earnest money. The order of the Tribunal was not complied with which compelled the petitioner to prefer Execution Petition which is pending consideration. In the meantime, the respondents have arbitrarily allotted the plots to ineligible persons including respondent Nos.3 to 7 in defiance of the directions of the Tribunal. She further submits that the petitioner had submitted representations on 16.01.2025 (Annexure P-11) and 04.02.2025 (Annexure P-12), but no action has been taken thereon. She submits that the petition be disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner dated 16.01.2025 (Annexure P-11) in a time bound manner.

3. Issue notice to the respondents.

4. At the asking of the Court, Ms. Avin Sandhu accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-GMADA and submits that although the appeal was allowed, but it was clearly stipulated in the order that the plots were to be allotted only if available.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner controverts the statement and submits that the respondents have arbitrarily allotted the plots to ineligible persons including respondent Nos.3 to 7 in order to defeat the claim of the petitioner.

6. Heard.

7. In view of the afore-noted facts, we deem it appropriate to dispose

of the petition with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner dated 16.01.2025 (Annexure P-11) in accordance with law, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

25.02.2026
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No