



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPMS/2785/2026</u> Ruchi Sharma --Petitioner Versus State Of Uttarakhand and others --Respondents <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.</u> Ms. Mudita Priyadarshani Shukla, Advocate for the petitioner through video conferencing. Mr. Rakesh Singh Kunwar, Additional CSC for the State. Mr. Lalit Miglani, Advocate for the respondent. 2. Petitioner applied for allotment of a residential plot to Haridwar Roorkee Development Authority (In short, "HRDA") A plot was allotted to her on 22.07.2025. Petitioner surrendered said plot within two months of its allotment. HRDA forfeited the entire amount deposited by petitioner for registration of the plot. 3. Petitioner made an application for refund of the forfeited amount. Her request was turned down by the competent authority vide order dated 16.03.2026. Thus feeling aggrieved, petitioner has approached this Court, seeking following reliefs: "i. Set aside the impugned communication/order



			dated 16.03.2026 (Annexure No.7, Page No. 6) issued by Respondent authority, whereby the petitioner's request for cancellation of allotment and refund of the registration amount deposited under the Ganga View Residential Scheme has been rejected. ii. Direct the respondent Authority to reconsider the petitioner's claim for cancellation of allotment and refund of the registration amount strictly in accordance with the applicable terms and conditions governing the Scheme, after duly considering the petitioner's representations dated 19.09.2025 and 24.01.2026, the contemporaneous communications placed on record and the observations that may be made by this Hon'ble Court. iii. In the alternative, direct the respondent Authority to determine, by a reasoned and speaking order, the petitioner's entitlement to refund after first determining the applicability of the Scheme Brochure governing the petitioner's application and deposit of the registration amount.” 4. Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to Clause 18.2.1 at page 34 of the writ petition, which provides that if any property is surrendered by applicant or cancelled by HRDA after 6 months and within 2 years of the allotment, then 20% of the registration amount will be forfeited and the balance amount will be refunded without any interest. Thus it is contended that the decision taken by HDRA, not to refund any amount to the petitioner, is unsustainable. 5. Learned counsel for the respondent refers to Clause 15.2.1 of the brochure issued by HRDA, which is enclosed at page 69 of the writ
--	--	--	--



		petition for contending that if the property is surrendered by the allottee within 3 months, then the entire registration amount is liable to be forfeited. 6. Mr. Lalit Miglani, learned counsel appearing for the HRDA, however, assures that if petitioner makes fresh representation for refund of registration amount, the same shall be placed before the Board of HRDA and the Board shall examine the request made by petitioner, as per law. 7. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of with liberty to petitioner to make fresh representation. If she makes such representation within two weeks from today, same shall be placed before the Board of HRDA and the Board shall consider the request made by petitioner and take decision, as per existing rules, regulations/byelaws, applicable in HRDA within three months. (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.) 22.09.2026 Mahinder
--	--	--