

Present: Mr. Gaurav Tyagi, Advocate for the applicant(s).

This application has been preferred seeking review of the order dated 29.08.2025 passed by this Court.

Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner submits that it has been erroneously recorded in paragraph 4 of the order that the petitioner had been offered and reallocated an alternative plot. He further submits that the applicant/petitioner was compelled to accept possession of 121.08 square metres plot instead of 180 square metres.

Heard.

The applicant/petitioner had been offered allotment of a plot measuring 180 square metres vide allotment letter issued on 27.12.2010 (Annexure P-1). However, possession of a plot measuring 121.08 square metres was offered to the applicant/petitioner which he had accepted. This Court after noticing that the applicant/petitioner had accepted possession of 121.08 square metres plot had held that the petitioner cannot seek allotment of a plot of a larger size. There appears to be an inadvertent error that instead of noticing that the applicant/petitioner had accepted 121.08 square metres plot out of the 180 square metres plot, it had been noticed that the applicant/petitioner has been offered an alternative plot measuring 121.08 square metres. Even if the contention of the counsel for the applicant/petitioner that he had not been offered an alternative plot and it was 121.08 square metres area out of the plot measuring 180 square metres it would not make any difference to the final outcome of the case. The applicant/petitioner had taken possession of plot measuring 121.08 square metres and therefore, he could not turn around and seek allotment of a plot of a larger size.

Consequently, we do not find any good ground to review the order passed by this Court on 29.08.2025. The review application stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

26.09.2025
SwarnjitS