DP No. - 247933, 0249472, 0249470, 0247 Status <u>Disposed of 24.353%, 25.5534</u>

Status <u>Disposed of 24.353%, 25.5534</u>

W-10

SS, 0249472, 0249420, 024 7420, 0252038, 025377

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

State of Haryana through Financial Commissioner & Principal Secretary, Department of Town and Country Planning, Civil Secretariat, Haryana, Haryana Urban Development Authority through its Chief Administrator, Sector 6,

Administrator, HUDA, Sector 14, Gurgaon.

2.

Panchkula.

Estate Officer-II, HUDA, Sector 56, Gurgaon

すしいのう

State of Haryana through Secretary, Department of Urban Estates, Haryana,

Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh.

Estate Officer, Haryana Urban Development Authority, Gurgaon.

State of Haryana through Secretary, Urban Development, Haryana Civil

Secretariat, Chandigarh.

Subject: , 1. CWP No. 2759 of 2013 (Mahender Pal Jain Vs. State of Haryana and

CWP No. 22922 of 2011 (Prakash Chandra Vs. State of Haryana and others)

others)

 \gg 3. CWP No. 14431 of 2012 (Saran Kumar Gandhi Vs. HUDA, Panchkula and others)

CWP No. 17415 of 2012 (Jagdish Singh Yadav Vs. State of Haryana and

🥕 5. CWP No. 25187 of 2012 (Arun Kumar Bhalla Vs. State of Haryana and others) others)

M(N.Sh.)

6. CWP No. 2760 of 2013 (Avinash Suri State of Haryana and others)

7. CWP No. 4656 of 2013 (Bhagwati Prasad State of Haryana and others)

 $_{ iny \sim}$ 8. CWP No. 7199 of 2013 (Vijay and others Vs. HUDA, Panchkula and

CWP No. 8583 of 2013 (Suvarna Mercantile Pvt. Ltd. Vs. State of Haryana another)

and others)

10. CWP No. 8584 of 2013 (Roukela Steel Pvt. Ltd. State of Haryana and others)

97073

OTHERS)
11. CWP No. 8585 of 2013 (Aircon Systems (I) Put Ltd. State of Haryana and others)

12, CWP No. 10336 of 2013 (Anita Dewan Vs. HUDA, Panchkula and another)

13. CWP No. 12062 of 2013 (Narendra Kumar Ganeriwal Vs. HUDA, Panchkula and another)

In continuation of this Court's order dated

Sir,

forward herewith a copy of Order dated 08.08.2013 passed by this Hon'ble High Court in the above noted Civil Writ Petitions, for immediate strict compliance alongwith copy

Given under my hand and the seal of this Court on this 27^{th} day of August 2013. BY ORDER OF HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

For Assistant Registrar (Writ) Superintendent (Writ)



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

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. OF 2013

MEMO OF PARTIES

Mahender Pal Jain S/o Rai Chand Jain R/o House No. 721, Urban Estate-2, Hisar, Haryana-125005.

.... Petitioner

Versus

- Department Chandigarh. of Haryana through Financial Commissioner & Principal Secretary, of Town and Country Planning, Civil Secretariat, Haryana,
- (12 Sector 6, Panchkula Haryana Urban Development Authority through its Chief Administrator,
- Estate Officer-II, HUDA, Sector 56, Gurgaon. Administrator, HUDA, Sector 14, Gurgaon.

4.

- Sh. Chandigarh. Department of Town and Country Planning, Civil Secretariat, Haryana, လ Ś Dhillon, Financial Commissioner œ Principal Secretary,
- 9 Sh. Authority, Sector 6, Panchkula. D. P. S. Nagal, Chief Administrator, Haryana Urban Development
- Sh. Manoj Khatri, Estate Officer-II, HUDA, Sector-56, Gurgaon.

Chandigarh,

Dated: 06.02.2013

(Dr. Surya Parkash) (Ashutosh Vig) P-1008/1998 P-2452/2008 Advocates
Counsel for the petitioner

Himmon

... Respondents

2 lover

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT

CHANDIGARH

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. 2750 OF 2013

.... Petitioner

Mahender Pal Jain

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

Civil quashing the decision dated 23.01.2013 Constitution of India for issuance being discriminatory, arbitrary, malafide and in violation of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India or in alternative directing the respondents to give possession of the originally allotted Plot to the petitioner prior to the proposed draw of lots or to include the plot of the petitioner in the draw of lots for an alternative residential plot of the same size i.e. marla in lieu of her originally allotted plot No.987, Sector 57, Gurgaon, of 6 Marla size, and hand over the possession of allotment the same, Writ Petition SP about under ∞ years have passed, since the Article of writ of certiorari 226/227 (Annexure P-10), of the

selective inclusion of the plots in draw of lots, investigated Further for directing the respondent No.1 for getting the Investigation, as the respondents No.5 to 7 are indulging in systematic corruption in the matter of allotment/re-allotment of alternative plots etc an independent agency/ Central Bureau 으

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

W

C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013

DATE OF DECISION: AUGUST 08, 2013

Mahender Pal Jain

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

2

C.W.P. No.22922 of 2011 (O&M)

Prakash Chandra

...Petitioner

Versus

....Respondents

State of Haryana and others

(3)

C.W.F. No.14431 of 2012

... Petitioner

Versus

Saran Kumar Gandhi

HUDA, Panchkula and others

....Respondents

C.W.P. No.17415 of 2012

...Petitioner

Jagdish Singh Yadav

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(5)

C.W.P. No.25187 of 2012

Arun Kumar Bhalla

...Petitioner

Versus

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013 etc.

<u>Ļ</u>

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

6

C.W.P. No.2760 of 2013

Avinash Suri

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

3

C.W.P. No.4656 of 2013

....Respondents

Bhagwati Prasad

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

8

C.W.P. No.7199 of 2013

Vijay and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Respondents

C.W.P. No.8583 of 2013

HUDA, Panchkula and another

Suvarna Mercantile Pvt. Ltd.

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

(10)

C.W.P. No.8584 of 2013

...Respondents

Roukela Steel Pvt. Ltd.

...Petitioner

Versus

GH COURT PUNJAB AND HARYANA HI

(13)

C.W.P. No.12062 of 2013

C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013 etc.

ယှ

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

C.W.P. No.8585 of 2013

Aircon Systems (I) Pvt. Ltd

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Petitioner

....Respondents

C.W.P. No.10336 of 2013

Anita Dewan

...Petitioner

Versus

....Respondents

HUDA, Panchkula and another

Narendra Kumar Ganeriwal

...Petitioner

Versus

HUDA, Panchkula and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:

Dr. Surya Parkash, Advocate. Mr. A.P. Bhandari, Advocate.

Amit Jhanji, Advocate.

Mr. B.S. Sudan, Advocate. Anirudh Kush, Advocate.

Mr. Rajbir Sehrawat, Advocate.

Hemant Bassi, Advocate

Mr. Siddharth Batra, Advocate. Raman Gaur, Advocate.

Rahul Garg, Advocate.

SATISH KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

of 2013, 4656 of 2013, 7199 of 2013, 8583 of 2013, 8584 of 2013, 8585 of not be 2013, 10336 of 2013 and 12062 of 2013. In all these cases the plots were 2013, 22922 of 2011, 14431 of 2012, 17415 of 2012, 25187 of 2012, 2760 allotted to the petitioners in Urban Estate, reason. A prayer has also been made that the alternative plots of the same petitioners in all these cases is that the possession of the allotted plots could size be allotted to them in the same Sector or in the nearby Sector as per **HUDA** policy given to them due to some dispute on the plots or for some other This order shall dispose of Civil Writ Petition Gurgaon. The grouse of the Nos.2759 of

allotted plots could not be delivered to the allottees due to some dispute on this Court those plots as Large number of cases for the same relief have in Gurgaon in many cases the possession of the original been filed in

following order was passed by this Court on February 08, 2013:-When CWP No.2759 of 2013 came up for motion hearing, the

acquisition, the land was released to the land owners. In the possession of the allotted plots could not be delivered for many cases, this court issued directions to the HUDA under dispute; or had been illegally encroached upon by allotment authorities various reasons, including of the allottees were still running from pillar to post, and allottee had to file directions land "Time and again, various writ petitions are being this were of alternative owners to consider the claims of those persons for court by complied with and in some cases, the contempt petition; whereas and other persons; the plots. that the plot holders, Some allotted 10 times, after to plot whom those

approached the HUDA possession of plots to thousands of allottees could not be delivered, in spite of plots having been allotted to them 10 years back. This problem is authorities, acute ij. but without any Gurgaon, where

direction that his petitioner had earlier approached this Court and got the delivered to him on the plea that plot was disputed one considered, included in the list of such allottees, supplied by the In spite Chief Administrator, HUDA, Panchkula, to the going to be held on February 13, 2013. Officer-II, HUDA, Gurgaon, for draw of lots, which is The of that, name of the petitioner has not been present case as possession of the plot could not be claim 1s for alternative allotment be an example, where

that there are several persons, who are also eligible to be discriminately in this regard for various reasons, and are petitioner that the HUDA authorities/officials are acting names have not been included. It is the contention of the considered for allotment of alternative plots, but their eligible persons arbitrarily Learned counsel is praying for deep probe in the entire Learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out excluding for allotment or including the names of the of alternative

Notice of motion

who is present in the court, accepts notice on behalf of also present in the court, accepts notice on behalf of Batta, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, who is respondents No.2, 3, 4, 6 and 7, and Shri Paramjeet respondents No. 1 and 5. On our asking, Shri Siddharth Batra, Advocate,

learned counsel for respondents No. 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 is After hearing learned counsel for the parties,

directed to supply the following information to this court Panchkula, within a period of one month affidavit of the Chief Administrator, HUDA,

- all Sectors in Gurgaon, and size-wise This information be supplied Sector-wise, plot number The total number of vacant plots of all the sizes in which are available for allotment.
- supplied plot-wise and sector-wise, mentioning possession of the allotted plot could not be delivered for reason, The total number of allottees in Gurgaon, to whom whatsoever. This information be also

the names of the allottees.

names of the allottees, and giving reasons why alternate supplied plot-wise and sector-wise by mentioning the allotment had to be made. allotted as alternative allotment. This information be also Till date, how many plots in Gurgaon have been

Adjourned to March 12, 2013.

allotment in Gurgaon be held till further orders." In the meanwhile, no draw of lots for alternative

common judgment. listed along with this case which are now being disposed of today by this With the passage of time, the other connected cases were also

Gurgaon, which are available for allotment, has been given as under: number of vacant plots of all the sizes in all Sectors (Estate Office wise) in the required information has been collected from the Estate Officer-I & II, Panchkula on April 23, 2013. In the said affidavit, it has been stated that 08.03.2013 was filed in this Court by the Chief Administrator, HUDA, Gurgaon on affidavits and as per the reports In pursuance of the aforesaid order, a detailed affidavit dated received, the total

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013 etc.

T//0		Grand Total	
1779		164	2 Marla
164		10	5 Maria
CT	0	7.7	
10	100	57	4 Marla
160	102	1100	6 Maria
107	112	155	
725	107	126	8 Marla
233	107	107	0 Maria
358	221	137	
ארכו סיינים	1//	151	4 Marla
328	1	11/1	1 Kanal
±€7	63	171	
2 2	0	19	1.5 Kanal
19		Estuace Spirit	Category
Total	Estate Officer-11	Estate Officer-I	

The total number of allottees in Gurgaon, to whom possession

of the allotted plot could not be delivered for any reason, whatsoever, has

been given as under:-

Gr	2 Marla 1	4 Marla 2	6 Marla			10 Maria	14 Marla 1	1 Kanal 0	1.5 Kanal		Category Estate
Grand Total	21	200	CE4	27/2	246	435	203	131		5	Estate Officer-I Estate Officer-11
	22		268	248	2	4:	107	2 :	13	5	CeT-11 10tm

The total number of plots in Gurgaon where the alternative

allotment has been made, has been given as under:-

1912	Estate Officer-I
1466	Estate Officer-II
3378	Total

supplied by the Chief Administrator, HUDA, Panchkula on affidavit was On that date, learned counsel for the petitioner stated that the information not complete in all respects and on the next date of hearing, i.e., 20.05.2013,

ф

availability of more plots by way of affidavit. Thereafter, on 24.05.2013 the learned counsel for the petitioner supplied other information with regard to

following order was passed by this Court:-

gone through the affidavit dated 8.3.2013 filed by the Chief 8.2.2013. We have also gone through the affidavit dated dated 24.5.2013 filed by the Estate Officer, HUDA today in 20.5.2013 filed by the petitioner as well as the affidavit Administrator, the Court along with Annexure-A1. "We have heard learned counsel for the parties and HUDA in response to our order dated

affidavit dated 8.3.2013 filed by the Chief Administrator, said affidavit certain information with regard to the plot HUDA contains incorrect information. It appears that in the affidavit dated 24.5.2013 filed by the Estate Officer, HUDAregard to availability of certain plots has not been given. The II, Gurgaon, which has been filed to explain the affidavit information filed by the During the course of hearing it transpires that the alternatively petitioner also does not contain the correct to certain persons as well as with

of some of the petitioners does not find mentioned in the list been listed alongwith this case, have pointed out that name of disputed plot though their plots are in dispute and they have not been given the possession of the allotted plots. The entire list and try to find out any left over name Estate Officer, HUDA, states that he will again re-look the Some of the counsel in connected cases which have

advertisement in the newspaper mentioning the disputed plot HUDA-I and II, Gurgaon, and the Administrator, to give an numbers to whom the alternative plots is to be made, and objiection, if their name is not find mentioned in the list so In the meanwhile, we further direct the Estate Officer, observation to all the allottees to

9

that their claim be also considered.

today concealment of any fact within a period of one month from information correctly after due verification and without any Court that he The Estate Officer is present in Court. He assures the will file additional affidavit giving all the

cases will be heard on 26.7.2013." The instant case along with the other This case be treated as part heard 15 connected

the order dated 24.5.2013 passed by this Court, the Estate Office advertised filed his affidavit dated 25.07.2013 in which it has been stated that as per In pursuance of the aforesaid order, the Estate Officer, HUDA-II, Gurgaon the list of all the disputed plots falling in his jurisdiction in two national daily newspapers and thereafter he received nine objections and those the petitioner in CWP No.2759 of 2013 is concerned, it has been stated that regard to alternative plot was also included in the list. As far as the plot of objections plot will be handed over to the petitioner in that case. It has been also clear at site. It has been further stated that the possession of the aforesaid Plot No.987 in Sector 57, Gurgaon originally allotted to the petitioner stated that some more plots were also found to be clear and for those plots it has been stated that the possession of the original allotted plots will be handed over to the allottees immediately without any delay. were duly taken care of and the claim of those objectors with

included in the list of disputed plots. The Estate Officer, HUDA, Gurgaon, the available plots is less but he has given an undertaking that after carving out who is present in the Court, states that in some category the number of new plots the number of plots in the said category Now after hearing the objections, 6 more plots will be have been made

19 - hover

C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013 etc

-10-

then the price of the original allotted plot will be charged from the said Officer also states that if the alternative plot is allotted in a different Sector, available as equivalent to the disputed plots in the said category. The Estate been made on the instructions of Chief Administrator, HUDA, Panchkula, Sector where the alternative plot has been allotted. acquisition cost, the said enhancement will be charged at the rate of the necessary modification in the Policy in this regard will be made by the Panchkula, who HUDA conveyed by Shri S.C. Kansal, Chief Controller of Finance, HUDA, But in case of enhancement of the price due to enhancement in is present in the Court. It has also been stated that the The said statement has

acceptable to all the petitioners. alternative allotment is to be made is fair and reasonable and the same is with regard to In our opinion, the aforesaid stand taken by the respondents charging the enhanced price of the Sector where the

the said draw all the original allottees are not adjusted, then allotment of the alternative plots will be held for the same Sector, and if in adjusting them in the remaining allottees, a draw of lots for those allottees will be held for plots are available held for allotment of the alternative plots in any other Sector where the allottees are not adjusted in the adjoining Sector, then a draw of lots will be It has been further agreed that firstly the draw of lots adjoining Sector, and if in the said draw all the for the for

given by this Court or any other competent court of jurisdiction with regard a particular plot the same be taken care of while making the alternative It has been further agreed that if there is any specific direction

11-

paid part or full enhancement amount of the original plot and has been payment on account of enhancement of the cost. alternative allotted plot in another Sector, then the enhanced compensation of the allotment. It has been further agreed that in case of an allottee, who has plot allotted will be charged after adjusting the previous

petitions be disposed of in the aforesaid terms with a further direction to the persons and in the different manners, as indicated above, and the said draw dates to be notified in the newspapers pertaining to different categories of Estate Officer-I & II to conduct the draw of lots in public view on different of certified copy of this order. We order accordingly. be fairly completed within a period of four months from the date of receipt Learned counsel for the parties have agreed that all these writ

pending in this Court the dispute with regard to alternative plot in Urban Estate, Gurgaon is Registry is directed to list all the other connected matters where

Sd/

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)

August 08, 2013 vkg

Elos (6/8/6)



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No. 22922 Civil Misc. No. 123 3 of 2011 of 2012

Prakash Chandra,

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

Annexures A-1 to A-3 exemption **APPLICATION under Section 151 C.P.C.** from filing certified copy **f**or 으

Respectfully Showeth:

- which is likely to succeed as per grounds taken therein. That applicant-petitioner <u>s</u>. filing the accompanied application,
- filed herewith for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court. available with the petitioner. However, true copies of the same are being just decision of the petition. The certified copies of same are not readily with the accompanied application, which are necessary for the prompt and N That the applicant-petitioner is filing Annexures A-1 to A-3, along

equity. Annexure A-1 to A-3 may kindly be exempted in the interest of justice and therefore, respectfully prayed that filing of certified copies of

Place: Chandigarh

Through counsel

Application-Petitioner

(Hemant Bassi) & (Puneet Bassi) Advocates

Dated: 77-8-7012

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

10

Civil Misc. No. 123 42 of 2012 In Civil Writ Petition No. 22922 of 2011

Prakash Chandra,

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

Application under Section 151 CPC praying for recalling of order, dated 20.07.2012 and for adjudication of the Writ Petition on merits

Respectfully Showeth:

- That the above mentioned Writ Petition was instituted in Hon'ble Court with the following prayer:-
- "(i) Issue any appropriate writ, order or direction especially a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to restore/ re-allot plot No. 119-P, Sector 31, 32-A Gurgaon in the name of the petitioner;
- (ii) Issue any appropriate writ, order or direction especially a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondents to hand-over the physical possession of plot No. 119-P, Sector 31, 32-A Gurgaon in terms of the Allotment Letter dated 18.04.1994;

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Misc. No of 2012

5

Civil Misc. No. <u>12341</u> of 2012

3

Civil Writ Petition No. 22922 of 2011

Prakash Chandra,

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

exemption from filing APPLICATION under Section 151 C.P.C. for Annexures A-4 to A-6 (Colly.) certified copies of

Respectfully Showeth:

- which is likely to succeed as per grounds taken therein. That applicant-petitioner is filing the accompanied application,
- are being filed herewith for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court. along not readily available with the petitioner. However, true copies of the same prompt and just decision of the petition. The certified copies of same are N with the accompanied application, which are necessary for the That the applicant petitioner is filing Annexures A-4 to A-6 (Colly.),

justice and equity. Annexure A-4 to A-6 (Colly.) may kindly be exempted in the interest of <u>`&</u>. therefore, respectfully prayed that filing of certified copies of

Place: Chandigarh

Application-Petitioner

Dated: 29-11-2:12

Through counsel

(Hemant Bassi) & (Puneet Bassi)

Advocates

14 pares

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Misc. No. 17 429 of 2012
In
Civil Misc. No. 12341 of 2012
In
Civil Writ Petition No. 22922 of 2011

Prakash Chandra,

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

Application under Section 151 CPC praying for placing on record Annexure A-4 to A-6 (Colly.)

Respectfully Showeth:

- That the above mentioned application is pending in this Hon'ble Court and is now pending for 31.01.2013.
- Ņ sought under RTI Act is awaited developed and under various litigations and that the information proposed to allot an alternate plot to the applicant, is totally unrecalling that the applicant had learnt that the area, where it has That the applicant had already highlighted in the application for
- ယ applicant, information has been supplied that the area is yet to be application submitted by the application under the RTI Act, it has under RTI Act by Sh. Binay Kumar, Advocate representing the That during the pendency of the matter, though in response to the department, however, stated that the said information has been forwarded to the in response to the application sent

C.M. Nos.12341-42 of 2012 and C.W.P. No.22922 of 2011 C.M. Nos.17428-29 of 2012 in

Prakash Chandra

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

Present:

for the applicant-petitioner. Mr. Hemant Bassi, Advocate,

Mr. Raman Gaur, Advocate

for respondents No.2 and 3

C.M. No.12341 of 2012

Application is allowed.

Exemption from filing certified copies of Annexures to

A-3 is granted.

C.M. No.12342 of 2012

per the communication dated 23.5.2012. respondents to allot an alternative one kanal plot in Sector 51, Gurgaon, as whereby the main writ petition was disposed of with a direction to the This is an application for re-calling the order dated 20.07.2012,

respondents, the application is allowed and the order dated 20.07.2012 is affidavit, hereby recalled which have For the reasons stated in the application, duly supported by an not been controverted by the counsel for the

C.M. No.17428 of 2012

Application is allowed.

Exemption from filing certified copies of Annexures A-4 to

A-6 is granted.

C.M. No.17429 of 2012

Application is allowed

The documents (Annexures A-4 to A-6) are taken on rec

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL JUDGE,

DO NO

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) JUDGE

vkg August 08, 2013 2016/18/2018

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.

Panchmarhi Apartment, Kaushabmi, Ghaziabad-201 019 (U.P.). Prakash Chandra, son of Late Sh. Ram Lakhan Singh Yadav, R/o 105,

....Petitioner

Versus

- Haryana, Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh. State of Haryana through Secretary, Department of Urban Estates,
- 2 Haryana through its Chief Administrator. Urban Development Authority, Sector-6, Panchkula,
- ယ Estate Officer, Haryana Urban Development Authority, Gurgaon. Respondents

FOR NATURE OF MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE DIRECTION ESPECIALLY A WRIT IN THE **APPROPRIATE** 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA CIVIL WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES PHYSICAL POSSESSION OF PLOT NO. 119-RESPONDENTS. ŦE ISSUANCE 0 WRIT, HAND-OVER ORDER 유 표 ANY S

Tool Tool

JUSTICE, (ANNEXURE P.24) PASSED BY THE CHIEF QUASHING THE ORDER DATED 07.03.2011 ORDER OR DIRECTION ESPECIALLY A WRIT IN THE NATURE ISSUANCE OF ANY APPROPRIATE WRIT, AGAINST THE PRINCIPLES OF NATURAL 31, 32-A GURGAON MADE IN FAVOUR OF PLOT ALLOTMENT IS TOTALLY ILLEGAL ALLOTMENT OF PLOT NO. 119-P, SECTOR RESPONDENTS DIRECTION ESPECIALLY A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE APPROPRIATE PETITIONER, GURGAON RESPONDENTS TO RESTORE OF ANY APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR 유 NATURE OF MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE DIRECTION ESPECIALLY A WRIT IN THE 18.04.1994, FURTHER FOR THE ISSUANCE P, SECTOR 31, 32-A GURGAON IN TERMS THE OTHER NO. AND ALLOTMENT Z 119-P, PERSON FURTHER HE WRIT, FURTHER 70 **SECTOR** NAME OF CERTIORARI LETTER AS CANCEL ORDER ISSUE FOR 푦 **RE-ALLOT** 유 <u>မ</u> DATED SAID THE AND 32-A ANY 뀲 OR.

ADMINISTRATOR HUDA.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No.22922 of 2011

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Prakash Chandra

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Hemant Bassi, Advocate,

for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Gaur, Advocate, for respondents No.2 and 3.

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013.

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

50

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL) JUDGE

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) JUDGE

PS

vkg

4

August 08, 2013

28/9/2017

Sel Co

90 28 99)2

Sylve 275kg



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No. 1443 of 2012

Saran Kumar Gandhi s/o F.C. Gandhi, r/o House No. 1048, Secter 14. Faridabad, Haryana.

... Petitioner

Versus

- Haryana Urban Development Authority
 Panchkula, Haryana,
 Through its Chief Adminsitrator
- Administrator
 Haryana Urban Development Authority,
 Gurgaon, Haryana.
- ယ Estate Officer-II Haryana Urban Development Authority, Gurgaon, Haryana. Respondents

nature Constitution of India for issuance Civil Writ Petition under Article 226 and 227 of the deliver the possession of UE, Gurgaor: which was allotted to the petitioner vide respondents have allotment letter dated 1.2.2005 (Annexure P-1), as the possession of plot inspite of payment of entire sale consideration of the said plot; of Mandamus directing the respondents illegally delayed the delivery of Plot No. 2159, Sector 57, of 8 writ in the ਰ o

the possession of the plot; from the respondents @ 24% till the actual delivery of And the petitioner is also entitled to receive interest

OR

fit in the facts and circumstances of the case Any other order, writ or direction as may be deemed

Respectfully showeth:-

- India, jurisdiction of this Hon'ble High Court under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India. That the petitioner is resident of Faridabad and is citizen of hence is competent to invoke the extraordinary
- amenable to writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble High Court. 2. That the respondents are statutory authorities and are
- measuring 289.3 sq. meters in Urban Estate, Sector 57, Gurgaon Ç both are governed by the terms and conditions enumerated in the Hon'ble High Court. That the petitioner as well as the respondents, petitioner is annexed as Annexure P-1 for the kind perusal of this Rs.12,15,060/- and a copy of the allotment letter issued to the vide allotment letter NO. 504 dated 1.2.2005 for a total price of That the petitioner was allotted a residential plot No. 2159,

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No.14431 of 2012

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Saran Kumar Gandhi

....Petitioner

HUDA and others

Versus

Present: Mr. A.P. Bhandari, Advocate, for the petitioner.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

.....Respondents

Mr. Siddharth Batra, Advocate,

for the respondents

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL) 1 ps

JUDGE

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) JUDGE

50

August 08, 2013 vkg

and eddec ansalis



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. 17417 of 2012

Sector 14, Gurgaon (Haryana) Jadish Singh Yadav son of Jawahar Singh, resident of House No.792, ...Petitioner

Versus

- Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh. State of Haryana through Secretary, Urban Development,
- S 2 Haryana Haryana Administrator, HUDA Office, Sector-6, Panchkula. Urban Urban Development Authority, Sector Development Authority through Chief 14,
- through its Estate Officer-II. Haryana Urban Development Authority, Sector-56, Gurgaon

Gurgaon through its Administrator.

...Respondents.

CIVIL WRIT PETITION under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India

- for issuance of appropriate writ order or direction,
- petitioner in lieu of plot measuring 220 sq.yards more particularly in the nature of mandamus thereby bearing No.3090, Sector 57, Gurgaon. directing the respondent to allot alternative plot to the

Cole

petitioner is found entitled to under equity and law Ħ. may be granted to the petitioner the alternative any other relief to which the

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

- 226/227 of the Constitution of India. extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court under Article Gurgaon Haryana and being citizen of India is competent to invoke the That the petitioner is resident of House No. 792, Sector 14,
- plot and the application of the petitioner was considered and vide memo 22x10 meter (220 sq.mtr.) bearing plot No.3090, Sector 57, Gurgaon. No.2317 dated 17.03.2005, the petitioner was allotted plot measuring That the petitioner applied for allotment of one residential
- inability to handover the possession of the plot. has been reported to be under dispute and the respondents showed their said plot and that the possession of the plot was not delivered as the plot That the petitioner has made the complete payment of the
- have been allotted alternative plots by draw of lots held on 22.08.2012 as **Annexure P-2** knocked the doors of this Hon'ble Court by filing different writ petitions available with the respondents 25.07.2012 (copy of letter is attached as Annexure P-1). evident from letter dated 14.08.2012, copy of which is attached as alleged that only 8 plots are disputed and all those persons have That 70 plots measuring 10 Marla in Sector 57, Gurgaon are as detailed in letter No.29224 dated In Sector 57, it

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No.17415 of 2012

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Jagdish Singh Yadav

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present: Mr. S.K.S. Bedi, Advocate,

for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Batra, Advocate,

for respondents No.2 to 4.

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013.

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL) JUDGE

No.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) JUDGE 32

vkg August 08, 2013

Dec 2755/15

28/9/2013



2 Dien

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

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. _____ OF 2012

Delhi. Arun Kumar Bhalla S/o Sh. B.S. Vidyalankar, R/o A-121, Ashok Vihar, Phase-III,

.... Petitioner

Versus

- Chandigarh, Department of Town and Country Planning, Civil Secretariat, Haryana, State of Haryana through Financial Commissioner & Principal Secretary,
- 2 Haryana Urban Development Authority through its Chief Administrator, Sector 6, Panchkula,
- Administrator, HUDA, Sector 14, Gurgaon.
- Estate Officer-II, HUDA, Sector 56, Gurgaon.

... Respondents

of the petitioner. Gurgaon (10 marla size) or of an alternative residential plot possession of the originally allotted Plot No.292, Sector 52, Civil Constitution same Writ size in lieu of his originally allotted plot to the of India Petition directing under Article the respondents 226/227 6 잌 give the

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

20

C.W.P. No.25187 of 2012

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Arun Kumar Bhalla

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Dr. Surya Parkash, Advocate

for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Batra, Addl. A.G., Haryana, for respondent No.1.

Mr. Raman Gaur, Advocate, for respondents No.2 to 4.

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL) JUDGE

Isal

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) 50 JUDGE

vkg

August 08, 2013

20/8/13

28/9/2013

ent Common

aduled dec ansolis

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT

7-2-13-862

CHANDIGARH

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. 2760 OF 2013

MEMO OF PARTIES

Delhi. Avinash Suri W/o Sh. Jaipal Singh Suri R/o H.No. 37/5, East Patel Nagar, New

.... Petitioner

Versus

- State of Haryana through Financial Commissioner & Principal Secretary, Department Chandigarh. of Town and Country Planning, Civil Secretariat, Haryana,
- 5 Haryana Urban Development Authority through its Chief Administrator, Sector 6, Panchkula
- Administrator, HUDA, Sector 14, Gurgaon.
- 4. Estate Officer-II, HUDA, Sector 56, Gurgaon.
- Ÿ Sh. Chandigarh. Department of Town and Country Planning, Civil Secretariat, Haryana, S. S. Dhillon, Financial Commissioner œ Principal Secretary,
- 9 Sh. D. P. S. Nagal, Chief Administrator, Haryana Urban Development Authority, Sector 6, Panchkula.
- 7. Sh. Manoj Khatri, Estate Officer-II, HUDA, Sector-56, Gurgaon.

... Respondents

Chandigarh, Dated: 06.02.2013

(Dr. Surya Parkash) (Ashutosh Vig)
Advocates
Counsel for the petitioner

* pover

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT

CHANDIGARH

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. 2760 OF 2013

Avinash Suri

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

allotment. of the same, 57, Gurgaon, of 10 Marla size, and hand over the possession marla in lieu of her originally allotted plot No.1672, Sector allotted Plot to the petitioner prior to the proposed draw of for an alternative residential plot of the same size i.e. 10 lots or to include the plot of the petitioner in the draw of lots directing the respondents to give possession of the originally Civil Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India or in alternative being discriminatory, arbitrary, malafide and in violation of quashing the decision dated 23.01.2013 (Annexure P-11), Constitution Writ of India as about 8 years have passed, since the Petition for issuance of under Article writ of certiorari 226/227 약 the

of alternative plots etc. systematic corruption in the matter of allotment/re-allotment Investigation, as the respondents No.5 to 7 are indulging in selective inclusion of the plots in draw of lots, investigated Further for directing the respondent No.1 for getting the independent agencỳ/ Central Bureau 으

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No.2760 of 2013

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Avinash Suri

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Dr. Surya Partkash, Advocate,

for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Batra, Advocate,

for respondents No.2 to 4, 6 and 7.

UNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

100

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) JUDGE 7 105

August 08, 2013 vkg



added dee nos he

202/0/8/8

elos:

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

C.W.P. NO.

OF 2013

Bhagwati Prasad son Apartment, Sector 13, Rohini, New Delhi. 110085. of late Sh. Roshan Lal, B-3/323, Sunrise

....Petitioner

Versus

- State Secretary, Department Secretariat, Haryana, Chandigarh. of Haryana through financial commissioner of Town and Country Planning, ζο Principal Civil
- 7 Administrator, Sector 6, Panchkula. Haryana Urban Development Authority, through its Chief
- ယ Administrator, HUDA, Sector 14, Gurgaon, Haryana.
- 4. The Estate Officer, HUDA, Sector 56, Gurgaon.

....Respondents

article

Civil Constitution Court may please be issue a writ in the nature to give possession of an alternative plot in lieu of mandamus directing the respondents to allot and the originally allotted plot No.3057, in Sector 57, Gurgaon on free hold basis which stands omitted as per new demarcation plan of Sector 57, Part-II, Hon'ble Court in CWP No.15386 of 2009 titled as Urban Estate, Gurgaon as per the judgment of this alternative plot. policy of HUDA dated 10.12.2007 for allotment of Subhash Puri Vs. State of Haryana and as per the Writ Petition under of India praying that this Hon'ble article 226/227 of

the respondents to hold Further writ in the nature of mandamus directing expeditiously and preferably period taking into consideration the judgment and policy of HUDA dated 10.12.2007 framed for passed in CWP No.15386 of 2009 dated 01.03.2012 the purpose of allotment of alternative plot. 21 fresh in a draw time of lots

amount deposited by the petitioner, on account of entitled to inability of the respondents to deliver the physical is further prayed that the respondents are also pay the interest (9) 9% p.a. the

Concin

possession of the plot in view of the policy dated

It is further prayed that during the pendency of the 10 marlas may be kept reserved for the petitioner present writ petition a residential plot measuring in Sector 57, Gurgaon.

deem fit and proper be passed in favour of the Any petitioner. other relief which this Hon'ble Court

Respectfully Showeth:-

- article 226/227 of Constitution of India by way of filing the present writ and being resident of India is entitled to invoke the writ jurisdiction under That the petitioner is the senior citizen and aged about 62 years
- annexed herewith as Annexure P/1. tentative price 220 2 sq. mtrs (10 marlas) vide allotment letter dated That the petitioner was initially allotted a plot No.3057, measuring of Rs.9,24,000/-. A copy of the allotment letter is being 17.03.2005 for a
- paid being annexed herewith as Annexure P/2 (Colly). terms and conditions of the allotment letter. the entire allotment price of Rs.9,24,000/- in six installments as per That the petitioner in lieu of the above mentioned allotment letter Copy of the receipts are

C.W.P. No.4656 of 2013

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Bhagwati Prasad

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Amit Jhanji, Advocate,

for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Batra, Advocate,

for respondents No.2 to 4.

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013.

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL) JUDGE

501

5

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) JUDGE

adoled Jee 2759 /15

vkg

August 08, 2013

2/18/19

State of Same



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No. of 2013

	-
Town Rohtak	Vijay son of Mohinder Singh Resident of H. No. 670, Kanal Colony Model
	Singh
,	Resident
	으 누
	i. No
;	. 670,
	Kanal
	Colony
	Model

- 2 Rohtak Anurag Hooda son of Sh. Jai Singh resident of H. No. 1013-P, Sector-1, HUDA
- ယ IV, M.D. University Campus Rohtak Dr. Dharam Sukh Dahiya son of Sh. Bharat Singh, resident of H. No. 12, Type-Om Parkash son of Nand Lal resident of H. No. 885/25, Near ITI Chinyot
- Colony, Rohtak

.....Petitioners

Versus

2 Haryana Urban Development Authority HUDA Office Complex C-3, Sector-6, Panchkula through its Chief Administrator Estate Officer-II, Haryana Urban Development Authority, Sector-56, Gurgaon

.....Respondents

Chandigarh.

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT) (NEERAJ SURA)

03-04-2013

Advocates

(Counsels for the Petitioners)

of India praying for the issuance of a writ in the nature of WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 of the Constitution possession of the plots, and further for issuance of any other on the amount deposited by the petitioners till the date of giving to the respondents to pay interest at the rate of 24% per annum alternate plots is finalized and further for issuance of a direction price from the petitioners for the original plots till the allotment of directing the respondent not to recover any enhancement of same sector to the satisfaction of the petitioners and further respondents to allot the alternate plots to the petitioners in the Annexure P-7 to Annexure P-10 and further directing the Certiorari/ mandamus quashing the letter dated 14-12-2012 at and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case. writ, order or direction, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

- present writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India. to invoke the extra ordinary jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court by way of filing the -That the petitioners are the resident of Haryana State, so they are competent
- 2 in Sector-57, Gurgaon from the priginal allottee Sh. Kalash Ghai and therefore he was 57, Gurgaon in the draw of lots. Likewise the petitioner No. 3 had purchased the plot That the petitioners No. 1, 2 and 4 were allotted the residential plots in Sector-

C.W.P. No.7199 of 2013

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Vijay and others

....Petitioners

Versus

HUDA, Panchkula and others

.Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Rajbir Sehrawat, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Siddharth Batra, Advocate,

for the respondents.

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013

5

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) JUDGE 13

vkg

August 08, 2013

ald Jeconsilis eld Timmen



29 18/13

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND CIVIL WRIT PETITION SSS F 2013 HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

School, Bahadurgarh 124507 15/438, Authorized Suvarna Khatio Mercantile Signatory, Wali Gali, Pvt. Z (Haryana) Near **K**. Ltd., Navjot Chaturvedi, through High

Petitioner

Versus

- 1. State Civil Secretariat, Department of Town Commissioner ofHaryana ႙ၟ၀ Haryana, and Principal through Country Chandigarh Secretary, Planning, Financial
- 2 Panchkula through Haryana its Urban Chief Administrator Development Authority Sector 6,
- ω. Administrator, HUDA, Sector 14, Gurgaon

4. **Estate** Gurgaon Officer-II, HUDA, Sector 56,

Chandigarh

Dated: 23-04-13

(Dr. Surya Parkash)
ADVOCATE
COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER

of toward 21

274, view plots of the same size i.e. 4 marlas in petitioner or an alternative residential originally directing 226/227 hand over the available allotted plots Gurgaon, of its and Writ with ofto the Plot No. original allotted plots No Petition allotted possession of the and the Constitution respondents the un-allotted petitioner respondents 191 plots under Sector of ţ0 ťΟ as land is same. Article India 43,. give and -unthe

Respectfully Showeth:

- S its petitioner Court extra ordinary residents of Delhi and Haryana and as such the Company run head office in Delhi. The petitioner company That bу tunning its the company citizens petitioner writ jurisdiction of India who ıs. business entitled 1s മ at Gurgaon with private of to this are mainly invoke Limited Hon'ble the
- ofpetitioner Delhi are very high employees share That the at Gurgaon needs commodities petitioner residential as is at the running prices Gurgaon. houses its of business land for The its

C.W.P. No.8583 of 2013

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Suvarna Mercantile Pvt. Ltd.

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryanaa and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Dr. Surya Parkash, Advocate

for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Batra, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana,

for respondent No.1.

ANDHARYANAFICIES

for respondents No.2 to 4. Mr. Raman Gaur, Advocate,

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013.

かかり

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL) JUDGE

Sa

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) JUDGE

vkg

August 08, 2013

BUS CHOUSENAND 21 35 CE 205 Column

garus / 9/2013

Do

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH CIVIL WRIT PETITION 3584 OF 2013

507 through Immediate Roukela Sharma Signatory, (Haryana) son Steel its 1488, Portfolio of Gangadhar Pvt. Authorized Sector 6, Ltd., ထု Securities (Formerly Sharma, Bahadurgarh -Signatory, Authorized Pvt. known as Kailash Ltd., 124

Petitioner

Versus

- 2 State Haryana Civil Secretariat, Department of Town and Country Planning, through Commissioner ofits Urban Haryana Chief Administrator හි Haryana, Chandigarh Development Principal through Secretary, Authority Financial Sector 6,
- 4. . ω Administrator, HUDA, Sector Estate Gurgaon Officer-II, HUDA, 14, Sector Gurgaon 56,

Panchkula

Chandigarh

Dated: 23-04-13

(Dr. Surya Parkash)
ADVOCATE
COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER

284, plots Civil view petitioner originally 226/227 possession of petitioner directing respondents allotted of of the Writ Sector its land as Oľ ofthe original same allotted Petition an alternative un-allotted the 43,. and 18 Constitution respondents same size available allotted Gurgaon, hand plots i.e. under plots 4 residential over plots marlas with to to and to Article India give -un-No. the the the

Respectfully Showeth:

- isits petitioner extra ordinary writ residents Court. Company running run head office in That bу of Delhi the company citizens petitioner Delhi. its business and Haryana and jurisdiction S. of India who The petitioner company entitled 18 В at Gurgaon of this private to as such the are invoke Hon'ble Limited mainly with the
- the Rourkela Immediate .2 name That Steel Pvt Ltd in record. the of the Portfolio petitioner petitioner has been changed රූං Securities was earlier Pvt. Ltd. but known as as
- ω. ofpetitioner share That the needs commodities petitioner is residential at running its Gurgaon. houses business for The its

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No.8584 of 2013

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Roukela Steel Pvt. Ltd.

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryanaa and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Dr. Surya Parkash, Advocate

for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Batra, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana, for respondent No.1.

for respondents No.2 to 4. Mr. Raman Gaur, Advocate

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013.

5

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL) JUDGE

PS

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) JUDGE

vkg

August 08, 2013

28/9/2013

38 added dee 255 hs

CHELL

IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH HIGH COURT FOR THE CIVIL WRIT PETITION SSSOF 2013 STATES OF

Signaturory, Aircon Himland Delhi-110015 Systems (I) Pvt. Ltd., through Authorized House, Mahavir Commercial Jhanwar Complex, r/o 303, New

Petitioner

Versus

- Commissioner State Department Planning, ofHaryana Civil 0fහි Secretariat, Town Principal through and Secretary, Financial Haryana, Country
- 2 Chandigarh Haryana through Urban its Chief Administrator Development Authority Sector
- ω Administrator, HUDA, Sector 14,

6

Panchkula

4. Gurgaon Estate Officer-II, HUDA, Sector 56,

Gurgaon

Chandigarh Dated: 23-04-13

(Dr. Surya Parkash)
ADVOCATE
COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER

16 Km

possession of the the petitioner as un-allotted plots un-allotted land 294-P allotted residential plots petitioner originally directing 226/227 respondents and hand over the Writ marlas in view of its original Sector plots of the Petition allotted plots or Constitution No. respondents 43,. Gurgaon, same. is available with of the same size 274, and Plot No. an under alternative of to to to Article India and give

Respectfully Showeth:

3

- its residents of Delhi 1S Court. extra ordinary writ\jurisdiction of this Hon'ble petitioner Company running its business run head office That bу the company citizens of India who in Delhi. The petitioner company petitioner and Haryana and is entitled 1'S Б at Gurgaon with private to as such the are invoke mainly Limited
- 0fpetitioner 2 share That the needs commodities petitioner residential is running at Gurgaon. houses its business for The

C.W.P. No.8585 of 2013

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Aircon Systems (I) Pvt. Ltd.

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryanaa and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Dr. Surya Parkash, Advocate

for the petitioner.

for respondent No.1. Mr. Siddharth Batra, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana,

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

Mr. Raman Gaur, Advocate, for respondents No.2 to 4.

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)

155

August 08, 2013 vkg

JUDGE

add ed dee 2758/13

टालिस

C.W.P. No. $\sqrt{6336}$ of 2013

Panchkula. Anita Dewan W/o Sh. Amit Dewan, R/o House No. 918, Sec. ,2

... Petitioner

Versus

- Haryana Administrator, HUDA, HUDA Complex, Sector 6, Panchkula. Urban Development Authority, through its Chief
- 2. Estate Officer, No. II, HUDA, Sector 56, Gurgaon.

... Respondents

Anita Dewan

-:2:

Writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to decide the Representation/objections dated 29.1.2013 (Annexure P-5).

And/or

To issue any other appropriate writ, order, or direction in the circumstances of the case.

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

- 3880/- per Sq. Mt. including the development charges etc Marlas, for which the rate fixed by the respondents was Rs. Marla etc. The plot involved in the present writ petition is 6 residential plots measuring 1 Kanal, 14 Marla, 10 Marla, 6 rates were for which the closing date was in May 2004. The different large for allotment of residential plots at Sector 57, Gurgaon That the respondents had invited applications from public at fixed by the respondents for allotment of
- 2 hold basis in December 2004, after succeeding in draw of lots balance 90% payment was to be made in installments. It was as per the scheme floated for Sector 57, Gurgaon. Further, the No. 836 of 6 Marla in Sector 57, was allotted to her on free paying 10% amount of the tentative price & accordingly Plot petitioner applied for a plot of 6 Marla category by

Anuta Dewan

W

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No.10336 of 2013

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Anita Dewan

....Petitioner

Versus

....Respondents

HUDA and another

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

CORAM:

Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, KKR, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Present:

Mr. Raman Gaur, Advocate

for the respondents.

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL) JUDGE

Sal

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH) JUDGE

August 08, 2013 vkg

added fee washis

5/2/3

CWP NO. 1906 OF 2013

NARENDRA KUMAR GANERIWAL S/O SHRI BHAGIRATH LAL R/O 4-A-12,

TALWANDI, KOTA-324005, RAJASTHAN

....PETITIONER

HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, SECTOR-6

VERSUS

PANCHKULA THROUGH ITS CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR.

Jo is ESTATE OFFICER-II, HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, SECTOR-56, GURGAON.

.....RESPONDENTS

4

0.68

THE CONSTITUTION OF CIVIL WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE RESPONDENTS ISSUANCE TO EXECUTE THE CONVEYANCE FAVOUR OF PLOT NO. I FOR FURTHER DELAY, TO PROVIDE PLINTH LEVEL CHARGED AMOUNT. INTEREST STARTING ACCOUNTS OF A WRIT IN THE NATURE 2199, H 뀲 CONSTRUCTION, OVERHAUL ILLEGALLY PETITIONER WITHOUT ANY AND SECTOR-57, REFUND ALONGWITH INDIA FOR THE & ARBITRARILY GURGAON IN DEED OF 유

AS ALSO FOR THE ISSUANCE OF ANY OTHER WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION, WHICH THIS HON'BLE COURT MAY DEEM FIT AND PROPER IN THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PRESENT CASE.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED;

- constrained to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Development Authority (hereinafter to be referred as HUDA), is invested substantial amount for the plot allotted by Haryana Urban retired from Instrumentation Ltd., a public sector undertaking and has That the petitioner, a humble law abiding Citizen of India, who has obscure manner. Court to protect his Constitutional and human right to property, which being violated by HUDA, a 'Local Authority', in arbitrary and
- 2 That respondent No. Development Authority Act, 1977 (hereinafter for the sake of brevity 1 established under the Haryana Urban

C.W.P. No.12062 of 2013

Date of Decision: August 08, 2013

Narendra Kumar Ganeriwal

...Petitioner

Versus

HUDA and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. B.S. Sudan, Advocate

for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Gaur, Advocate,

for the respondents

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

For orders, see C.W.P. No.2759 of 2013

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL) JUDGE 501

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)

JUDGE

vkg

August 08, 2013

