



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

536

CWP-11890-2007 (O&M)

Date of decision: 10.07.2026

MARI MUTTU

... Petitioner

Versus

H.U.D.A.

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Jai Bhardwaj, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Naveen Kumar, Addl. AG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel submits that claim of the petitioner is squarely covered by the judgments in **Randhir Singh Vs Haryana Urban Development Authority**, CWP-811-1996, decided on 25.09.1996 and **Ramesh Chand and others vs State of Haryana and others**, CWP-2544-1996, decided on 16.01.1997 and that even legal notice, Annexure P3, had not been decided, thus, prays that his claim be considered and decided in light thereof, in a time bound manner.

2. Learned State counsel has no objection to the limited prayer made.

3. In view of the above and without commenting on the merits of the case, this petition is hereby disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the claim of the petitioner, expeditiously, in accordance with law, taking note of the aforesaid judgments, which this Court has no reason to believe the authorities would not address in a just, fair and reasonable manner. Upon doing so, after notice and hearing offered to him and if found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if the orders are adverse to the interest of the petitioner, the same shall contain reasons and he shall be free to seek legal redress thereupon.

**(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

10.07.2026

ashok

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No