

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT

JODHPUR

राजस्थान जजमणि

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1311/2022

Rajat Sales Agency, Through Its Proprietor Vimal Kumar S/o Shri Loon Chad Salecha, Aged About 42 Years By Caste Oswal, Resident Of Jerla Road, Balotra.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur.
2. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Ltd., Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur, Through Chairman And Managing Director.
3. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Ltd. Khed Road, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Respondents

Connected With

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1219/2022

Surya Texcom, Through Its Proprietor Smt. Samta Devi Wife Of Shri Naresh Kumar, By Caste Jain, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Khasra No. 19, Jerla Road, Balotra, District-Barmer

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur.
2. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Ltd., Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur, Through Chairman And Managing Director.
3. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Ltd. Khed Road, Balotra, District- Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1314/2022

Maha Bajrang Processors, Through Its Proprietor Narendra Lalwani Son Of Shri Narayan Lal Sindhi, By Caste Sindhi Lohana, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Nayapura, Ward No. 8, Balotra, District- Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur.
2. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Ltd., Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur, Through Chairman And Managing Director.
3. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Ltd. Khed Road, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1532/2022

Saraf Dyeing Company, Through Its Proprietor Jugal Kishore Saraf S/o Shri Rajaram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Agarwal Colony, Behind Adarsh Vidhya Mandir, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner Cum Allotment Committee, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2258/2022

Sanwal Ram S/o Shri Tulsa Ram, Aged About 69 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 15, Gandhipura, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.) Proprietor Of Santosh Dhupayi Works.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
2. Rajasthan Industries And Investment Corporation Limited,

Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.

3. Regional Manager, Rajasthan Industries And Investment Corporation, Kher Road, Industrial Area, Balotra, Barmer.
4. Municipal Council, Through Its Commissioner, Jodhpur Road, National Highway 112, Balotra, Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2261/2022

Mahadadaji Industries, Through Its Proprietor Omprakash S/o Shri Mehar Chand Khatri, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Hinglaz Street, Gali No. 2, Ward No. 23, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner Cum Allotment Committee, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2264/2022

Harish Peding Works, Through Its Proprietor Shri Kanhaiyalal S/o Shri Lekhraj Khatri, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 23 Bal Vidhya Mandi, Mahadev Colony, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.

3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner Cum Allotment Committee, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2300/2022

Manju Processing House, Through Its Proprietor Smt. Manju Devi W/o Shri Satyanarayan, Aged About 47 Years, Ward No. 7, Near Ramdhan Office, Agarwal Colony, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner Cum Allotment Committee, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2563/2022

Geeta Process, Address - 99, Main Mandiya Road, Pali Through Its Proprietor Ganesh Ram S/o Shri Nathmal Ji, Aged About 65 Years, B/c Ghanchi, R/o 2, Palliwalo Ka Bass, District Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corp. Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd. I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5449/2021

M/s. Rishabh Dying Industries, Through Its Proprietor Shri Gyanendra Kumar S/o Shri Udayraj Ji, Aged About 40 Years, R/o 27 Jhuron Ka Bas, Pali, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Raj. State Industrial Deve. And Investment Cor. Ltd., (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited, (Riico) , Pali.
3. The District Collector Pali, Pali, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6069/2021

Sumit Process, 41, Bada Bas, Pali Marwar (Raj). Through Its Proprietor Smt. Shankuntla W/o Amar Chand Jain, Age 67 Years, By Caste Jain, R/o 41M Bada Bas, Pali Marwar (Raj).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Invest. Corp. Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd. I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman, Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre Pali, Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.
5. M/s Riico Prints, A-58, Sumerpur Road, Industrial Area, Pali. Through Proprietor Haji Mohd. S/o Ahmed, By Caste Chhipa Muslim, R/o A-88, Chhipo Ka Hethla Baas, Pali.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6135/2021

M/s. Vikram Textile Mils, Through Shri Trilok Chand S/o Shri Meetha Lal Jain Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of B-5, Sidhi Vinayak Complex, Marudhar Nagar, Pali (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Corporation Limited, Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, The Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited, Iti Road Pali.
3. The Regional Manager, The Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited, Iti Road Pali.
4. The Land Allotment Committee, Through Its Chairman, District Collector, Pali, The Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Corporation Limited.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6351/2021

Bhurji Dyeing, Address A/62, Sumerpur Road Industrial Area, Pali. Through Its Proprietor, Smt. Shabana W/o Shri Umar Farooq Ji, Age 41 Years, By Caste Chhipa Musalman, Presently R/o 62-C, Jama Masjid Road, District- Pali (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marga, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman, Allotment Committee, Riico, Pali.
4. The District Industries Center, Pali, Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6354/2021

M/s. Hazi Mohammed, S/o Shri Gafoor Ji Chhipa Address A-28, Sumerpur Road, Pali. Through Its Proprietor, Shri Hazi Mohammed S/o Shri Gafoor Ji, Age 71 Years, By Caste Chhipa Musalman, R/o 31, Chhipo Ka Hathela Bas, District- Pali (Raj.) Through Power Of Attorney Mohammad Ismail S/o Shri Hazi Mohammed, Age 53 Years, R/o 31, Chhipo Ka Hetla Bas, Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marga, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman, Allotment Committee, Riico, Pali.
4. The District Industries Center, Pali, Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6474/2021

K.b. Fab Tax, 41, Bada Bas, Pali Marwar (Raj.) (Huf Firm) Through Its Karta Amarchand Samdariya S/o Shri Heera Lal Ji, Age 67 Years, By Caste Samdariya, R/o 41, Bada Bas, Pali Marwar (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector Cum Chairman, Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager Cum Member Secretary.
5. M/s Memuna Mohd Hussain, Through Proprietor Shri Noor Mohd. S/o Shi Mohd. Hussain, R/o 13, Busi Ki Gali, Pyara Chowk, District Pali.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6475/2021

M/s Classic Fabrics, Address A/62, Sumerpur Road Industrial Area, Pali. Through Its Proprietor, Smt. Aamana W/o Shri Fareed Mohd., Age 84 Years, R/o 62 Juma Masjid Road, District Pali (Raj.) Power Of Attorney Mohd. Saleem Chhipa S/o Shri Fareed Mohd, Age 48 Years, R/o 62 Juma Masjid Road, District Pali (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector Cum Chairman, Allotment Committee, Riico, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager Cum Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6790/2021

M/s. Shantilal Rajendra Kumar, B-2 Tilak Nagar, Pali Through Its Properietor, Rajendra Sancheti S/o Shri Premrajji, Aged About 51 Years, R/o B-2 Tilak Nagar Mahaveer Nagar, Pali (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Corp. Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, The Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited, Iti Road Pali.
3. The Regional Manager, The Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited, Iti Road Pali.
4. The Land Allotment Committee, Through Its Chairman District Collector, Pali The Rajasthan State Industrial

Development And Corporation Limited.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9975/2021

Bhanwar Lal S/o Shri Bhura Ram Choudhary, Aged About 55 Years, R/o College Road, Pali (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Pali.
3. Allotment Committee, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Through Its Chairman, The District Collector, Pali.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9981/2021

Bhanwar Lal S/o Bhura Ram Choudhary, Aged About 55 Years, College Road, Pali (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corp. Ltd., (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico) Pali.
3. Allotment Committee, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Through Its Chairman The District Collector, Pali.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9994/2021

Narayan Ram S/o Shri Bhura Ram Choudhary, Aged About 50 Years, College Road, Pali (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corp Ltd. (Riico), Through Its Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Pali.
3. Allotment Committee, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Through Its Chairman, The District Collector, Pali.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12208/2021

Khivraj Amarchand Gadiya, Ramlila Maidan, Pali (Raj.), Through Its Proprietor, Gotam Chand Gadiya S/o Shri Amar Chand Ji, Age 64, By Caste Jain, R/o Veer Durga Das Nagar, District Pali (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Investment Corporation Ltd., I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector Cum Chairman, Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager Cum Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13675/2021

M/s Chippa Abdul Gani Abdul Gafurji, Through Its Proprietor Mohd. Yasin S/o Shri Abdul Gafurji, Age 78 Years, R/o 43, Rangnia Mohalla, Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director,

Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.

2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13693/2021

M/s. Ganesh Finishing, Address Agarwal Lane, Sindhi Colony, Pali Through Its Partners - 1. Shri Rang Nath Bajaj S/o Shri Gordhan Ji, Age 51 Years, By Caste Bajaja, 2. Smt. Sushila Bajaj W/o Shri Gordhan Ji, Age 71 Years, By Caste Bajaja, Both R/o 18, Bikaneria Ka Bas, District Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector Cum Chairman Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager Cum Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4895/2022

M/s Ramjan Desizing, Through Its Proprietor, Ramjaan S/o Shri Mohd. Iqbal, Age 40 Years, By Caste Chhipa, R/o 105, Badi Masjid Ke Peeche, Pyara Chowk, Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector Cum Chairman, Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.

4. The District Industries Centre, Pali Through General Manager Cum Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16361/2022

Mehta Dyeing Industries, Through Its Proprietor Shri Sampat Raj Bhandari S/o Shri Sohranraj Bhandari, R/o F-1-50, Mandia Raod, Pali (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), District Pali.
3. The Allotment Committee, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Through Its Chairman, The District Collector, Pali (Raj.).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3013/2023

M/s Mahendra Prints, Through Its Proprietor Mahendra Kumar Jain S/o Shri Paras Mal Jain, Aged About 49 Years, R/o 9, Vardhman Nagar, Pali Marwar (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Pali, District Pali.
3. Land Allotment Committee, Through District Collector Pali, District Pali.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3783/2021

Momin Dying Company, Through Its Proprietor Farid Mohammad S/o Shri Hussain Ji , B/c Musalman, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Madina Masjid Ke Pas, Ward No. 17, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chairman And Managing Director Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Ltd. Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Ltd., Khed Road, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6272/2021

Madina Dying Works, Through Its Proprietor Yusuf Ali S/o Shri Hazi Mohammed, B/c Musalman, Aged About 71 Years, R/o Marwar Hardware, Khed Road, Old U.p. Center Gali, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chairman And Managing Director Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Ltd. Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Ltd., Khed Road, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10335/2021

Govind Ram S/o Bhura Ram Choudhary, Aged About 45



Years, College Road, Pali (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corp Ltd. (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Pali.
3. Allotment Committee, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Through Its Chairman, The District Collector, Pali.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2341/2022

M/s Mohd Khwaja Dyeing Company, Through Its Proprietor Jamaludeen S/o Mangu Deen, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Near Lalji Ka Than, Ward No. 17, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Kher Road, Industrial Area, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Respondents

Connected With

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 921/2011

Parasmal

----Petitioner

Versus



State Of Raj. And Ors.

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11443/2011

Mohd. Imran

----Petitioner

Versus

State Collector Barmer And Ors

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11534/2011

Sona Ram

----Petitioner

Versus

State Collector Barmer And Ors

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13162/2012

M/s. Mohd. Yunush Dyeing Works

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Raj. And Ors

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13163/2012

M/s. Mayur Madhavi Mills

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Raj. And Ors

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13164/2012

Niraj Kumar

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Raj. And Ors

----Respondent



S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2594/2014

Sanwal Ram

----Petitioner

Versus

State And Ors.

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3526/2015

M/s Man Ganga Dying Company

----Petitioner

Versus

Raj. State Indu. Deve. And Inv. And Anr.

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15331/2017

M/s Arafat Textiles, Balotra, District Barmer Through Manager, Imran S/o Shri Shabir, Resident Of Main Bazar, Balotra Raj.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Through Its Manag, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Riico, Kher Road, Industrial Area, Balotra, District Barmer

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15340/2017

M/s Tak Textiles, Through Its Proprietor Imran S/o Shri Shabir, Resident Of Main Bazar, Balotra Raj.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Through Its Manag, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.

2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Kher Road, Industrial Area, Balotra, District Barmer

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15443/2017

Ismile Khan S/o Shri Barkat Khan Chhipa, Resident Of Lalji Ka Than, Balotra, District Barmer Proprietor Of M/s M. Janata Textile, Jerla Road, Balotra.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Through Its Manag, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Kher Road, Industrial Area, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15444/2017

M/s Rajasthan Textiles Through Proprietor Shri Alta Ahmed S/o Noor Mohammed, Resident Of Sadar Bazar, Khatriyon Ka Chowk, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Through Its Manag, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Kher Road, Industrial Area, Balotra, District Barmer

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15600/2017

Radheyshyam Textile Through Proprietor Santosh Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Nathu Lal Sharma, By Cast - Brahmin,

R/o Mohini Niwas, Near Old Bus Stand, Balotra, District - Barmer, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Through Its Manag, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Industrial Area, Balotra, District - Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1740/2018

M/s Parasram Fabrics, Through Its Proprietor Nand Kishore S/o. Shri Rameshwar Lal, By Caste Agarwal, R/o. Agarwal Colony, Near Agarsen School, Balotra, Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Through Its Manag, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Invetment Corporation Limited Riico, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7272/2018

Madina Textile Through Its Proprietor Mohd. Ayub S/o Shri Mohd. Habib, Resident Of Near Madina Masjid, Ward No. 17, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Riico Limited, Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial

Development And Investment Corporation Limited
Rii, Balotra, District Barmer.

3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7275/2018

Jilani Dyeing Company Through Its Proprietor Mohd. Hussain S/o Shri Mohd. Habib, Resident Of Near Madina Masjid, Ward No. 17, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Riico, Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Rii, Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11201/2018

M/s Mohd. Sayed Dying Company, Through Its Proprietor Bundu Khan S/o, Usman, By Caste Musalmaan, Having Its Office At Harizan Basti Ward No. 22, Balotra, District Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited, (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12023/2018

Maha Arihant Finishing, Through Its Proprietor Ashok Kumar S/o Shri Mishri Mal Aged About 42 Years, Rabariyon Ka Tanka No. 1, Balotra, Dist. Barmer

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited(Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, Dist. Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12092/2018

Maha Sagar Chemical, Through Its Proprietor Hastimal S/o Shri Sagarmal, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 4, Regarpura, Dhanji I Dhani, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12118/2018

Krishna Dyeing Company, Through Its Proprietor Gautam Chand Jain S/o Mishri Mal Jain Aged About 45 Years,

Resident Of Jerla Road, Ward No. 15, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12136/2018

Maharani Dyeing Company, Through Its Proprietor Bhagwana Ram S/o Shri Tulchha Ram, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Mahadev Colony, Ward No. 22, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17397/2018

Madras Finishing Works, Proprietor Sakina Banu W/o Shri Vali Mohd., Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Third Crossing, Regarpura, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17409/2018

Faird Mohd Dyeing, Proprietor Hinifa Wd/o Shri Farid Mohd, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Panghat Road, Balotra Through Her Power Of Attorney Holder Shri Imran S/o Shri Sabirji, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Sadar Bazar, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17411/2018

Reliance Dhulai Works, Through Its Proprietor Om Prakash S/o Shri Mishri Mal Mali, R/o Gandhipura,



Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19149/2018

M/s. Lala Ram Kana Ram, Having Its Office At Opposite Roop Ji Ka Bera, Near Shamshan Ghat, Balotra, District Barmer, Through Its Power Of Attorney Holder Mohd. Imran S/o Mohd. Sabir, Age About 34 Years, R/o Nagina Masjid, Chatriyo Ka Morcha Panghat Road, Balotra.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.2320/2022

Ramdhhan Cotton Mills, Through Its Proprietor Smt. Basanti Devi W/o Shri Raghuveer Prasad, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 4, Agarwal Colony, Balotra, District

Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner Cum Allotment Committee, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

Connected With

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3831/2013

Suryodaya Industries, Balotra

----Petitioner

Versus

Raj. State Indu. Deve. And I.c. Ltd., And An

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5101/2013

Manbhawan Dhulai Works, Balotra

----Petitioner

Versus

Raj. State Indu. Deve. And I.c. Ltd., Andanr

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7558/2013

K.d. Process,

----Petitioner

Versus

Raj. State Indu. Deve. And I.c. Ltd., Andors

----Respondent



S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8369/2013

M/s. Ashok Kothari And Company,

----Petitioner

Versus

Raj. State Indu. Deve. And I.c. Ltd., Andors

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8539/2013

Mohammad Gani

----Petitioner

Versus

State Andors.

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9144/2013

Gulam Rasool

----Petitioner

Versus

State And ors.

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3177/2014

M/s Mahadev Rangai

----Petitioner

Versus

State And Ors.

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7504/2015

M/s Vandana Synthetics Mills

----Petitioner

Versus

Riico And Ors.

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8330/2016

M/s Prem India Fabrics

----Petitioner



Versus

State And Anr.

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10046/2016

M/s. Vishal Textiles

----Petitioner

Versus

State And Anr

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10305/2016

M/s. Jeetu Products

----Petitioner

Versus

State And Anr

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5332/2021

M/s. Vinayak Febtek, Through Its Proprietor Smt. Vandana Karnawat W/o Shri Rajnish Karnawat, Aged About 51 Years, R/o 1, Ahinsha Complex, Ambedkar Circle, Pali, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Raj. State Industrial Deve. And Investment Cor. Ltd., (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited, (Riico), Pali.
3. The District Collector Pali, Pali, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6110/2021

1. M/s Narendra Tex Printers, Through Its Proprietor Narendra Kumar Talesara S/o Udairaj Ji Talesara, Aged About 53 Years, R/o 138, Mahaveer Nagar, Pali, Rajasthan.

2. M/s Narendra Printers, Through Its Proprietor Rakhi Talesara W/o Narendra Kumar Talesara, Aged About 50 Years, R/o 138, Mahaveer Nagar, Pali, Rajasthan.
3. M/s Madhu Tax Mils, Through Its Proprietor Smt Madhu Bohra W/o Pramod Kumar Bohra Aged About 45 Years, R/o 75, Jodhpuriya Bass Pali, Rajasthan.
4. M/s Akashy Finishing, Through Its Proprietor Vijay Kishore Bohra S/o Mishrimal Bohra, Aged About 50 Years, R/o 14, Nehru Nagar, Pali, Rajasthan.
5. M/s Nakoda Industries, Through Its Proprietor Smt Nisha Baliya W/o Mukesh Baliya, Aged About 45 Years, R/o 16, Baliyo Ka Bass, Pali, Pali, Rajasthan.
6. M/s Manak Enterprises, Through Its Proprietor Pradeep Kumar Golcha S/o Sumer Mal Golcha, Aged About 55 Years, R/o 212, Veer Durga Das Nagar, Pali, Pali, Rajasthan.
7. M/s Rahul Fabrics, Through Its Proprietor Sanjay Kumar Golcha S/o Sumer Mal Golcha, Aged About 57 Years, R/o 212, Veer Durga Das Nagar, Pali, Pali, Rajasthan.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Pali.
3. District Collector, Pali, Pali, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8407/2021

M/s Navkar Finishing, Ramlela Maidan, Pali. Through Its Proprietor Smt. Rama Kanwari W/o Shri Dileep Kumar Ji, Age About 59 Years, By Caste Jain, R/o 27, Bada Bas, District Pali.

----Petitioner



Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corp. Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd. I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Center, Pali. Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9411/2021

Vinod Textile Mills

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd. I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman, Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali. Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2028/2022

Magan Dyeing, Through Its Manager Mahesh Lalwani S/o Late Shri Daya Ram Lalwani, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Gandhipura, Vanarchowk, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And

Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.

2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner Cum Allotment Committee, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10653/2023

Sonu Industries, Bajrang Bari, Pali Through Its Partners -

1. Rajmal Kawad S/o Shri Vijay Raj Kawad, Age 52 Years, By Caste Jain, R/o 108, Sojatiya Bas, Pali.
2. Vidhya Devi W/o Shri Nand Kishore, Age 67 Years, R/o 12, Khatriyo Ka Mohalla, Pali

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrail And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrail And Investment Corporation Ltd. I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector Cum Chairman, Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager Cum Member Secretary.

----Respondents

Connected With

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17709/2022

Hanuman Fabrics, Bajrang Bari, Pali Through Its Proprietor Saurabh Arora S/o Shri Nand Kishore Arora,

Age 40 Years, By Caste Arora, R/o Khatriyo Ka Mohalla, Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector Cum Chairman Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali Through General Manger Cum Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11020/2023

Kamal Prints, Bajrang Bari, Pali Through Its Partners- 1. Manish Arora S/o Shri Nand Kishore Arora, Age 47 Years, By Caste Arora, R/o Khatrio Ka Mohalla, Pali. 2. Ram Niwas Jat S/o Shri Pancha Ram, Age 53 Years, R/o Mewra, Tehsil Degana, District Nagaur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd. I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10859/2023

Ganpati Process, 6, Setho Ka Bas, Pali (Raj.), Through Its Proprietor Vinod Kumar Lodha S/o Balchand J, Age 59 Years, By Caste Jain, R/o 6, Setho Ka Bas, Pali (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd. I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10999/2023

Nandu Dyeing, Bajrang Bari, Pali Through Its Partners- 1. Nand Kishore Arora S/o Shri Mohan Lal Ji Arora, Age 70 Years, By Caste Arora, R/o 12, Khatrio Ka Mohalla, Pali. 2. Kavita Kawad W/o Shri Sohan Ji Kawad, Age 52 Years, By Caste Kawad, R/o Sojatiya Bas, Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd. I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11004/2023

Raju Processing Center, Bajrang Bari, Pali Through Its Proprietor - Naman Arora S/o Shri Nand Kishore Arora, Age 39 Years, By Caste Arora, R/o Khatriyo Ka Mohalla, Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd. I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11757/2023

Shwet Shilp Industries, Shastri Nagar, Bajrang Bari, Pali, Through Its Partners - 1. Vinod Kumar Maheshwari S/o Shri Sawar Mal, Age 67 Years, By Caste Maheshwari, R/o 2-Kha-10, Housing Board, Pali. 2. Smt. Soniya Arora W/o Shri Naman Arora, Age 37 Years, R/o Khatriyo Ka Mohalla, Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman, Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.

4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1615/2022

Ramdhan Industries, Through Its Proprietor Shri Sarju Kishore Gupta S/o Shri Ramdhan Ji, Aged About 57 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 4, Agarwal Colony, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Cum Allotment Committee Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

Connected With

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1470/2022

Smt. Sita Devi W/o Shri Jai Prakash Goyal, Aged About 59 Years, Ward No. 3, Agarwal Colony, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.), Proprietor Of Shree Process.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Dev. And Investment Corp. Limited (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.

4. The Divisional Commissioner Cum Allotment Committee, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2322/2022

Hem India Mills, Through Its Proprietor Babu Lal S/o Shri Bhiam Ram Mali, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Agarwal Colony, Ward No. 3, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Cor. Ltd. (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.
4. The Divisional Commissioner Cum Allotment Committee, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2270/2022

Ramanuj Industries, Through Its Proprietor Shrawan Kumar S/o Shri Pukhraj, Aged About 47 Years, Ward N. 7, Near Ramdhan Office, Agarwal Colony, Balotra, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Cor. Ltd. (Riico), Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Balotra, District Barmer.
3. The District Collector Cum Allotment Committee, Barmer.

4. The Divisional Commissioner Cum Allotment Committee, Jodhpur (Camp Balotra).

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10709/2023

Jai Hanuman Desizing, Bajrang Bari, Pali Through Its Proprietor Varsha Arora W/o Saurabh Arora, Age 38 Years, R/o Khatriyo Ka Mohalla, Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd., Through Its Chairman And Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
2. The Senior Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial And Investment Corporation Ltd. I.t.i. Road, Pali.
3. The Collector-Cum-Chairman Allotment Committee, Punayata Industrial Area, Pali.
4. The District Industries Centre, Pali, Through General Manager-Cum-Member Secretary.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6887/2015

Mohan Lal Mandot

----Petitioner

Versus

State And Ors

----Respondent

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11780/2021

M/s. Chopra Industries, Through Its Proprietor Shri Pukhraj Chopra S/o Shri Ganeshmal Chopra, Aged About 72 Years, R/o 105, Mahaveer Nagar, Pali (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Raj. State Industrial Development And Investment Cor.

Ltd., Through Its Managing Director, Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.

2. The Regional Manager, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited (Riico), Pali.
3. Allotment Committee, Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment Corporation Limited Through Its Chairman, The District Collector, Pali.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. O.P. Mehta with Mr. V.D. Gaur, Mr.B.S. Sandhu, Mr. Girish Kumar Sankhala, Mr. Rakesh Arora, Mr.N.S. Rajpurohit, Mr.Devkinandan Vyas, Mr.Mahaveer Singh, Mr. Rahul Sharma for Mr. Pankaj Kumar Bohra,, Mr.P.D. Bohra, Mr. Hemant Ballani, Mr.Tushar Moad, Mr. Sunil Vyas and Mr.Rajesh Choudhary.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. K.S. Rajpurohit, AAG with Mr.Rajat Arora, Mr. Sanjeet Purohit, Mr. R.D. Bhadu Dy.G.C., Mr. Aidan Choudhary, Mr. Talat Bari & Mr. M.S. Purohit.

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI

Judgment

Reserved on 01/08/2023, 07/08/2023, 17/08/2023, 18/08/2023, 19/08/2023 & 21/08/2023

Pronounced on 31/08/2023

1. Though the present petitions were heard separately and on different dates, but looking into the commonality of the issues involved in all the present petitions, notwithstanding the marginal variation in the contextual facts, they are being decided by this common judgment.

1.1. The instant petitions pertain to allotment of industrial plots by the Rajasthan State Industrial Development And Investment

Corporation Limited (RIICO), in lieu of shifting of the industries, in compliance of the directions issued by a Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court in D.B. Writ Petition (PIL) No.2481/2002 (Mahesh Pareek Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors., decided on 02.04.2004), whereby directions were issued for shifting of the existing industries situated in the non-conforming areas/municipal areas of Balotra and Pali districts (Rajasthan).

1.2. In pursuance of the same, a survey was conducted under the directions of the concerned authorities, whereupon a survey list was prepared showing that certain industrial units were found functional in the non-conforming areas of Balotra and Pali districts. Thereafter, it was decided, as a mandatory measure, that those industrial units whose names have been mentioned in the survey list and applies accordingly, in pursuance of the concerned advertisement(s), shall be considered for the allotment of the industrial plots in question, subject to mandatory production of the documents, as mentioned in the said advertisement(s).

1.3. However, the aforementioned process, as regards the districts of Balotra & Pali, in particular, gave rise to twin issues. The said twin issues relating to the said districts, which fall for consideration of this Court in the present petitions, read as under:

(a) Certain industrial units, whose names though figured in the survey list, but have not been considered for allotment of the industrial plot(s) in question.

(b) Certain industrial units, whose names, neither figured in the survey list, nor they have been considered for allotment of the industrial plot(s) in question.

2. For the purpose of the present analogous adjudication, this Court considers it appropriate to draw the outline thereof, by mentioning, in the present judgment, the factual matrix pertaining to the districts of Balotra and Pali (Rajasthan), separately; likewise, the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and the observations of this Court, shall also be drawn separately.

2.1. However, prior thereto, it is considered appropriate to reproduce the prayer clauses of the said two writ petitions, covering, in sum and substance, the reliefs, as claimed in all the instant petitions, as hereunder:

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1311/2022:

"It is, therefore, most humbly and respectfully prayed that this Writ Petition of the petitioner may kindly be accepted and:-

*(i) By an appropriate writ, order or direction, the impugned rejection order dated 13.05.2017 (**Annexure-18**) as far as rejection of candidature of petitioner firm for allotment of industrial plot is question may kindly be quashed and set aside and consequence thereof the application for allotment of industrial plot made by the petitioner firm (**Annexure-10**) may kindly be allowed and the respondent authority R.I.I.C.O. may kindly be directed to allot the industrial plot in favour of the petitioner firm forthwith at rate prevailing on the date of making application.*

(iii) any other order or direction, which this Hon'ble Court deem just and proper be passed in favor of the petitioner firm.

(iv) *Costs of this writ petition may kindly be awarded to the petitioner firm.*"

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1311/2022:

"It is, therefore, most humbly and respectfully prayed that this writ may kindly be allowed and by a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order and directions:

- (i) *The e-auction notice dated 03.03.2021 (Annexure-7) may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside, to the extent, it propose to make allotment of 10 industrial plot situated in Punayata Industrial Area, Pali;*
- (ii) *The order dated 19.02.2021 (Annexure-8) alongwith letter dated 10.03.2021 passed by the District Collector, Pali may also be quashed and set-aside.*
- (iii) *The respondent RIICO may further be directed to make proper compliance of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Court in the earlier round of writ petition and to make allotment of industrial plot to the petitioner.*
- (iv) *Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in favour of the petitioner may kindly be granted.*
- (v) *The cost of the writ petition be allowed in favour of the petitioner."*

3. To appropriately deal with the first issue i.e. **(a) Certain industrial units, whose names though figured in the survey list, but have not been considered for allotment of the industrial plot(s) in question**, the factual matrix is being taken from the above-numbered **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1311/2022 (for adjudication relating to Balotra District)** and the above-numbered **S.B. Civil Writ Petition**

No.5449/2021 (for adjudication relating to Pali District),

while treating the same as lead cases.

3.1. As per the facts pleaded in **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1311/2022 (for the adjudication relating to Balotra District)**, the petitioner-Firm was running a small scale industry in municipal limits of the Balotra District (Rajasthan). On count of increasing pollution levels in Balotra, the aforementioned Public Interest Litigation (PIL) was preferred before this Hon'ble Court, wherein the Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court, on 02.04.2004, issued certain directions; the relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced as hereunder:-

"I. The Pollution Control Board shall immediately make fresh inspection of the Textile Processing Units at Pali and surrounding areas and in case any of the units are found to be creating pollution and not connected to the CETPs shall be closed.

II. The units which are creating pollution shall adopt measures to eliminate pollution.

III. RIICO shall set up industrial area at a suitable place exclusively for textile processing units. The industrial area must be located at an appropriate distance from residential areas. RIICO shall set up the industrial area within a period of six months and the industry shall be shifted to the industrial area from residential areas immediately thereafter.

IV. The trust shall make modification in the CETP so that the emissions therefrom are compatible with the norms prescribed by the Pollution Control Board.

V. The industrial units which are discharging the industrial pollutant on the land or/and river shall be closed forthwith.

VI. The State shall employ experts to assess the damage caused to the environment and health of the public by the pollution created by the Units. On assessment of the damage,

the concerned authority shall file a report in this court within a period of eight weeks, whereupon the question of payment of compensation by the units on the principles of polluter pays shall be determined".

3.1.1. In compliance of the said directions, the respondent- RIICO issued an advertisement dated 14.10.2010 and invited applications for making allotment of the industrial plots at the new and appropriately distant location for establishing the industries in question, in lieu of shifting of the industrial units; the said advertisement was published in the newspaper, wherein the list of documents, for the purpose, was also mentioned.

3.1.2. The petitioner-Firm applied for allotment of the land under the RIICO Disposal of Land Rules, 1979 alongwith the requisite demand draft. The respondent-RIICO vide order dated 12.09.2012 however, rejected the application of the petitioner on the ground that petitioner has not furnished certain requisite documents.

3.1.3. The petitioner thereupon, filed a various representations against the aforesaid rejection order; whereafter the petitioner also filed a writ petition (S.B.C.W.P. No.10936/2013) before this Hon'ble Court, which was decided on 13.12.2021, while directing the respondents to pass a fresh order, after duly considering the documents so furnished by the petitioner. Thereafter, the respondent-RIICO hold a Meeting on 13.05.2017, and drawn the Minutes thereof, rejecting the petitioner's application on the ground that the petitioner-Firm was not in existence at the time of rejection, whereas the plots were lying vacant, residential colonies

are established and other shops/godowns were running on the site concerned.

3.1.4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the impugned orders were passed by the respondent-RIICO without giving any opportunity them.

3.1.5. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that on one hand, the respondent-RIICO did not voluntarily furnish the copy of the impugned rejection orders, while on the other hand, the industrial plots were being allotted continuously to the other industrial units by auction.

3.1.6. Learned counsel for the petitioners also submitted that the petitioners filed applications for allotment of the industrial plots in question along with all the relevant documents mentioned in the advertisement published by the respondent-RIICO, and therefore the entire impugned action of the respondent is illegal and not justified in law.

3.1.7. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that the petitioners have the electricity connections, Pollution Certificates, Title Documents, Balance Sheets/ Income Tax Returns, and other documents mentioned in the advertisement prior to the year 2004 i.e. 02.04.2004, and therefore, on that count also, the impugned action of the respondent is not sustainable in the eye of law.

3.1.8. Learned counsel for the petitioners also submitted that the petitioners are eligible for allotment of the industrial plots in question, as though they have produced all the relevant

documents, but the respondent-RIICO without considering the same passed the impugned orders.

3.1.9. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that the Municipal Council, Balotra conducted the survey and issued the list of the industries running in the Municipal Limits of Balotra, and also prepared the survey report, wherein the names of the petitioners were included, which clearly shows the existence of the petitioners as industry in Balotra.

3.1.10. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submitted that various plots are still lying vacant, but the respondent-RIICO wishes to make fresh allotment of such plots through auction, which cannot be permissible, because the industrial area has been established only for the industries, which are sought to be shifted. Therefore, as per learned counsel, the entire conduct of the respondent-RIICO is arbitrary and against the rule of law.

3.1.11. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents, while opposing the aforesaid submissions made on behalf of the petitioners, submitted that due deliberations, pertaining to the applications of the petitioners for the allotments in question, were made by the Allotment Committee comprising the Divisional Commissioner and the District Collector, whereupon, the Committee has recorded a specific reason that the petitioners have not submitted the mandatory documents, and thus, they do not fall under the criteria for allotment of the industrial plots in question.

3.1.12. Learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that for the purpose of shifting of the industries in question, the Municipal Council, Balotra conducted the survey, wherein 115 units were being found functional in non-conforming areas of Balotra. Thereafter, the Allotment Committee was constituted and headed by the District Collector, Balotra. The advertisement in question was issued in the newspaper, for submission of applications alongwith the relevant documents i.e. Electricity bills, Notices issued by Pollution Control Board, Balance-Sheet, Income Tax Returns, Sales Tax Valuations, Purchase & Sales Bills, Audit Reports, Documents pertaining to ownership of land and affidavit.

3.1.13. Learned counsel for the respondents also submitted that the entire process was completed by the Committee headed by the Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur, after site inspection, and finally, all the applications were duly considered and decided, thereafter, the allotments of the industrial plots in question were done.

3.1.14. Learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that the applications of the petitioners were rejected, no sole on the ground of non-production of all the requisite documents, as mentioned in the advertisement dated 14.12.2010, , but also, at the time of deciding the applications of the petitioners, certain other deficiencies, such as i.e. show cause notice of water pollution board, electricity bill, income tax return, audit report and other relevant documents, were found, which also were mandatory as per the advertisement dated 14.12.2010.

3.1.15. Learned counsel for the respondents also submitted that the some industrial plots in question, as were demanded by the petitioners, were already allotted to the other industrial units, who were duly entitled therefor, on count of submission of all the requisite documents; apart therefrom, dual allotment of the same industrial plots is not permissible in law.

3.1.16. It was further submitted that the final decision in the matter of allotment was taken by the Committee headed by the District Collector in the year 2014 as well as the Committee headed by the Divisional Commissioner in the year 2017, and therefore, the concurrent rejection of the applications of the petitioners so validly made, is justified in law.

3.1.17. It was also submitted that the petitioners herein could not show their *bona fides* so far as the present case is concerned, because the documents, which were submitted by the petitioners were not reliable and there were various deficiencies in the same; therefore, the industrial plots in question were not allotted to them; thus, the impugned action of the respondent-RIICO does not suffer any legal infirmity.

3.2. As the facts pleaded in **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.5449/2021 (for adjudication relating to Pali District)**

would reveal, in compliance of the directions issued by the Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court on 02.04.2004 in the aforementioned PIL Petition, the respondent-RIICO, Pali issued an advertisement dated 11.05.2009, inviting applications for making allotments of the industrial plots, at the new and appropriately

distant location for establishing the industries in question, in lieu of shifting of the industrial units; the said advertisement was published in the newspaper, wherein the list of documents, for the purpose, was also mentioned.

3.2.1. The petitioner filed an application along with all the relevant documents before the respondents for allotment of the industrial plot in question, the respondents vide minutes of the meetings dated 29.09.2009 and 05.11.2009, rejected the said application.

3.2.2. The said rejection order was challenged by the petitioner before this Hon'ble Court by preferring a writ petition (S.B.C.W.P. 1186/2010), whereupon this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 17.04.2013, directed the respondent to reconsider the application of the petitioner. The respondents thereupon, filed a Special Appeal before a Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court; whereupon the Hon'ble Division Bench vide order dated 11.07.2016 remanded the matter back to the Hon'ble Single Bench. Thereafter, the Hon'ble Court vide order 28.08.2019, directed the respondents to re-consider the application of the petitioner.

3.2.3. The respondent issued a notice dated 08.01.2021 to the petitioner calling upon it to produce all the relevant documents within the seven days thereafter, in compliance whereof, the petitioner submitted all the relevant documents. The respondent vide order dated 19.02.2021 rejected the claim of the petitioner. Subsequently, the respondent proceeded to issue an e-auction notice on 03.03.2021 and also initiated the process of allotment of plots in Punayata Industrial Area by way of auction.

3.2.4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that as per the documents, the petitioners being situated in a non-conforming area prior to the year 2003-2004, they were entitled to get the industrial plots in question; however, the respondent in any arbitrary manner and without any reasoning passed the impugned orders.

3.2.5. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that name of the petitioners were included in the survey list, prepared in pursuance of the survey so conducted by the concerned municipal body, and thus, they were duly entitled for the allotment of the industrial plots in question.

3.2.6. Learned counsel for the petitioners also submitted that petitioners though produce all the documents as mentioned in the advertisement in question, but the Allotment Committee, while completely ignoring such documents, passed the impugned orders, which is highly illegal and unjustified in law.

3.2.7. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that in accordance with the order passed by the Hon'ble Court, and as per the advertisement, there was no requirement of all the documents, as required by the respondents; in case the petitioners were able to produce any one document, they were fully eligible for the allotment of the industrial plots in question.

3.2.8. Learned counsel for the petitioners also submitted that various writ petitions was preferred before this Hon'ble Court, wherein the Hon'ble Court directed the respondent to reconsider the applications of the petitioners, but despite of the same, the

respondent, in any arbitrary manner, rejected the application of the petitioners vide the impugned orders.

3.2.9. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that in some of the writ petitions, the respondent allotted the industrial plots in question to the tenant of the land, while rejecting the applications of the landlord (petitioners), without there being any consent for such allotment; therefore, as per learned counsel, on that count also, the impugned action of the respondent is unjustified in law.

3.2.10. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents, while opposing the aforesaid submissions made on behalf of the petitioners, submitted that the Allotment Committee was headed by the District Collector, and thus, the respondent-RIICO was not the sole decision-making authority; rather the respondent-RIICO is only one of the members of the Allotment Committee, and therefore, the impugned orders passed after considering all the relevant aspects of the case, are justified in law.

3.2.11. Learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that the Allotment Committee followed the conditions, as mentioned in the advertisement in question as well as the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Court. Learned counsel also submitted that the Allotment Committee has considered in all 102 matters, and thereupon, as many as 90 claims have been rejected, which did not fulfill the necessary conditions for the allotment of the industrial plots in question.

3.2.12. Learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that the Industrial Area was planned with 333 plots and the process of allotment was started in the year 2005; whereafter, the allotment was done in a phased manner; the necessary documents, as required were; (a) Title Proof such as allotment letter/patta (if the industry is situated within the municipal area) and jamabandi (in case of industry is situated upon the agricultural land); (b) Electricity bill of the present / earlier time; (c) Affidavit that the industry has already been closed down; (d) In case of tenant, the rent agreement and the undertaking of owner to the effect that he will not claim the plot in future; (e) Clearance issued by the Pollution Board.

3.2.13. Learned counsel for the respondents also submitted that after a perusal of the applications of the petitioners, many deficiencies were found in the aforesaid documents i.e. the Electricity bill indicated that the connection was pertaining to the domestic category / duplicate bill, lack of pollution board certificate, title / patta of the land issued after the year 2004 etc.; and in some cases, there was no existence of the industry in year 2004. Therefore, the petitioners were not eligible for allotment of the industrial plots in question.

3.2.14. Learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that in the order dated 02.04.2004, the Hon'ble High Court (In S.B.C.W.P. No.1186/2010) observed that, "*The Allotment Committee is directed to consider the applications of the petitioners afresh for allotment of existing plots in industrial area, punayata, Pali objectively while taking into consideration the*

documentary proof submitted by the petitioners and pass reasoned order in this regard". Therefore, the Allotment Committee were duly powered to pass the impugned orders, after due deliberation, and thus, the impugned action of the respondent is justified in law.

3.2.15. Learned counsel for the respondents also submitted that the Allotment Committee passed the impugned orders, after duly considering the individual application, examining all the documents submitted by the petitioners as well as after affording an adequate opportunity of hearing to all the petitioners and others; therefore, there is no illegality in the impugned orders passed by the respondent.

3.2.16. It was further submitted that each and every case was dealt with individually and the documents as well as each and every aspect of the matter were taken into consideration by the Allotment Committee; only thereafter, the applications of the ineligible industrial units, including the petitioners, were rejected vide the impugned orders.

4. As regards the second issue i.e. **Certain industrial units, whose names, neither figured in the survey list, nor they have been considered for allotment of the industrial plot(s) in question** also, it is informed that the factual matrix, as set out hereinabove qua the first issue, being substantially same, needs no separate narration in the present judgment.

4.1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that numerous textile industries were in operation prior to 2004 in the municipal

area of Balotra/Pali, and in pursuance of the directions issued by the Hon'ble Court, all the said existing industries were closed down including the industries of the petitioners; in such circumstances, the petitioners were clearly entitled to get allotment of the industrial plot in the industrial area, by way of shifting/relocation and till such claim of the petitioners or any other individual Firm is pending, there is no justification available with the respondent authorities to make allotment of the plots to anyone else.

4.1.2. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that the respondent-RIICO issued a notification dated 09.12.2011 and the same was published in the newspaper, inviting applications along with relevant documents from the industrial units established prior to the year 2004 and whose names were not mentioned in the survey list prepared by the concerned municipal body. In pursuance of such notification, total 132 applications were received by the respondent. While the said applications remained pending for three years, the respondent vide communication dated 18.06.2014 rejected the applications in its meeting dated 09.06.2014.

4.1.3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the different survey lists were prepared by the different authorities, whereupon certain industrial units raised objections regarding the genuineness and correctness of the said survey list(s).

4.1.4 Learned counsel for the petitioners also submitted that the impugned communication dated 09.10.2014 issued by the respondents without giving opportunity of hearing, and thus, no justification was found in the impugned order. It was further submitted that the petitioners-industries were found in non-conforming areas prior to the year 2004, but despite of the same, the respondent did not consider their applications.

4.1.5. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that the respondents were not justified in law, in rejecting the applications of the petitioners for allotment of industrial plots in place of the industrial units already closed down, in pursuance of the directions of the Hon'ble Court.

4.1.6. Learned counsel for the petitioners also submitted that before taking the impugned decision of rejection of the petitioners' applications in the meeting headed by the Hon'ble Minister concerned, the petitioners were not given an opportunity of hearing; furthermore, such decision was decision without duly appreciating the merits of individual application; thus, the impugned decision is also violative of the principles of natural justice and suffers from non-application of mind.

4.1.7. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that the petitioners' case is supported by documentary evidence, which clearly reveals that the petitioners' unites were in operation in the non-conforming area of Balotra/Pali prior to 2004; the said units were closed down in compliance of the Hon'ble Court's order, whereby, the Hon'ble Court in unequivocal terms directed the

respondent to shift the industries falling in non-conforming area to a new industrial area to be established by the respondents. Thus, on that count also, the impugned orders are unjustified in law.

4.1.8. Learned counsel for the petitioners also submitted as per the respondent's own stand, the scrutiny of 131 pending applications and decision thereon is to be taken by the Committee headed by the District Collector. Such applications were received in pursuance of the notification so issued by the respondent itself. As per learned counsel, it was also assured to the petitioners that the individual application shall be considered on its own merit. However, the respondents have changed their stand and the applications were rejected vide the impugned orders, which is not sustainable in the eye of law.

4.1.9. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that the respondents themselves knowing fully well that there were discrepancies in the survey list; in pursuance of the notification issued in the year 2011, 132 applications were received duly supported by documentary evidence, including that of the petitioners; but despite the same, the impugned orders were passed by the respondent, which is not justified in law.

4.1.10. Learned counsel for the petitioners also submitted that the present case is a glaring example of hostile discrimination, on count of the fact that various other incumbents whose names were not mentioned in the survey list and filed the application at a later stage, their cases were dealt with in pursuance of the representations submitted by them; however, the same treatment

was not meted out to the other similarly situated incumbents, including the present petitions; thus, on that count also, the impugned orders deserves to be quashed and set aside.

4.1.11. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that the petitioners have also submitted their applications for allotment of the plot in pursuance of the notification issued in the year 2011, but the respondent did not take any decision thereon; now the respondents are charging new rates, for no delay on the part of the petitioners. Thus, as per learned counsel, the impugned action on the part of the respondents is not sustainable in the eye of law.

4.1.12. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents, while opposing the aforesaid submissions made on behalf of the petitioners, submitted that the District Collector in its individual capacity has directed issuance of the advertisement in the year 2011, thereby inviting applications from the applicants, even if their names have not been mentioned in the survey list. Pursuant to the said advertisement, 132 applications were received, but none of the applicants have deposited the requisite fee/application fee alongwith the applications.

4.1.13. Learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that the decision to call for applications even from the incumbents not having their name in the survey list, has not been taken by the Allotment Committee, nor any approval of the same has been taken from the Industries Department.

4.1.14. Learned counsel for the respondents also submitted that the issues in question were discussed in a meeting of a high level committee in the year 2015, under the Chairmanship of the Hon'ble Minister of Industries, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur, comprising also the Managing Director, RIICO, District Collector and various others officers, and in the said meeting, a conscious decision was taken that since the industries, including the petitioners, were not found in the survey being conducted by the municipal body concerned, therefore, their applications cannot be considered for allotment of the industrial plots in question. Therefore, as per learned counsel, it was decided in the said meeting to reject and return all the 132 applications so received in pursuance of the advertisement in question.

4.1.15 It was further submitted that the decision to quash the said process of allotment, which was initiated in pursuance of the advertisement dated 09.12.2011, and the action of rejecting 132 applications was taken in the meeting dated 08.06.2015, while the petitioners did not challenge the said decision, and thus, the writ petitions are not maintainable.

4.1.16 It was also submitted that the survey list was a mandatory precondition and the petitioners' names were not included in survey list, and therefore, the rejection of the said application is completely justified in law.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties as well as perused the record of the case.

5.1. As regards the first issue, pertaining to Balotra District, this Court observes that after the aforementioned order of the Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court ,the industrial units in Balotra were shifted at a distant place from the residential areas; the municipal body of Balotra conducted the necessary survey, whereafter the respondent-RIICO issued the advertisement dated 14.10.2010 and invited applications for allotment of industrial plots in question and the said advertisement was published in the newspaper. The petitioners applied along with documents for allotment of the industrial plots in question. The respondent-RIICO vide the impugned orders rejected the applications of the petitioners on the ground that the petitioners have not filed all the requisite documents.

5.2. This Court further observes that the respondent-RIICO clearly mentioned the list of the all necessary documents, which were required to be submitted by the concerned industrial units, including the present petitioners, in pursuance of the advertisement in question; the list of the documents, pertaining to the period prior to 02.04.2004, as mentioned in advertisement, were as follows:-

- “1. दिनांक 02.04.04 से पूर्व के बिजली के बिल कि सत्यापित प्रतिलिपि।
2. दिनांक 02.04.04 से पूर्व के राज. प्रदूषण नियंत्रण मण्डल के द्वारा अवैध प्रदूषित इकाईयों को जारी किये गये नोटिस की सत्यापित प्रतिलिपि।
3. इकाईयों के भूमि स्वामित्व से संबंधित दस्तावेजों की प्रमाणित व सत्यापित प्रतिलिपि।
4. दिनांक 02.04.04 से पूर्व की स्थापित इकाईयों को किरायेदार/लाईसेन्सधारी द्वारा चलाये जाने से संबंधित किरायेनामे/लाईसेन्स की प्रमाणित सत्यापित प्रतिलिपि।

5. दिनांक 02.04.04 से पूर्व की इकाईयों की बैलेन्स शीट की प्रतिलिपि/इक्कम टेक्स रिट्टन की प्रतिलिपि/सेल टेक्स मूल्यांकन की प्रतिलिपि/क्य-विक्रय के बिल की सत्यापित प्रतिलिपि।

6. स्थापित इकाई के दुकान अधिनियम के तहत पंजीकरण की सत्यापित प्रतिलिपि।

7. स्थापित इकाई के ऑडिट रिपोर्ट की सत्यापित प्रतिलिपि।

8. स्थापित इकाई को इस आशय का शपथ पत्र देना होगा कि औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में शिफ्ट होने के बाद में पूर्व में स्थापित इकाई में कोई औद्योगिक कार्य नहीं करलंगा। और अगर करलंगा तो मेरा औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में आवंटित भूखण्ड निरस्त करने का अधिकार समिति का होगा तथा इकाई द्वारा पूर्व की स्थापित इकाई बंद करने की फोटो प्रस्तुत करनी होगी।"

5.3. This Court also observes that the petitioners have not submitted the all the documents as required, and even in certain documents so filed, the same suffered from many deficiencies i.e. the some electricity bills submitted by the petitioners, were pertaining to the period after 02.04.2004, and that, the same were the bills pertaining to domestic connection, which were not permissible, as per the advertisement in question.

5.4. This Court further observes that in some cases, the petitioners have also not produced the relevant show cause notice/certificate issued by the Pollution Control Board, as per the advertisement in question.

5.5. This Court also observes that in some of the case, the petitioners did not produce any Balance Sheet/Income Tax Returns for proving that they are eligible for allotment of the industrial plots in question.

5.6. This Court further observes that the aforementioned list of documents was mandatory in nature and the industrial units,

including the petitioners were required to submit all the documents, as per the advertisement in question; thus, even if a single document is not submitted, then the concerned industrial units, including the petitioner, cannot claim allotment of the industrial plots in question. This Court also observes that in the present case, not a single petitioner herein has made the mandatory compliance with regard to the aforementioned list of documents; even in the documents so submitted, 2-3 deficiencies were found individually in each of the case.

5.7. This Court also observes that after a perusal of the material produced by the petitioners and the respondents in each of the petitions, individually, there is not a single case, which comes under the category of eligible industrial units, so as to get the allotment of the industrial plots in question.

5.8. This Court further observes that the Allotment Committee included the District Collector Barmer, Sub-Divisional Officer, Balotra, General Manager, DIC, Barmer, Regional Officer, Pollution Control Board, Commissioner Municipal Board, Balotra, Unit Head RIICO Balotra and other members.

5.9. This Court also observes that the applications of the petitioners were duly reviewed by the Allotment Committee comprising the Divisional Commissioner and the District Collector, in an objective manner, and after considering the claim and the objections, the impugned orders were passed; therefore, it is clear the Allotment Committee not biased towards any industrial unit, and thus, the impugned orders so passed are justified in law.

6. Having regard to the first issue pertaining to Pali District, this Court observes that the respondent-RIICO, Pali issued the advertisement dated 11.05.2009 inviting applications for allotment of the industrial plots in question at the new and appropriately distant location for establishing the industries in question, in lieu of shifting of the industrial units. The petitioners filed the applications with all relevant documents before the respondents for allotment of the industrial plots in question; the respondents, vide the minutes of the dated 29.9.2009 and 05.11.2009, rejected the said applications. Thereafter, the order for re-consideration of the applications was passed by the Hon'ble Court, as informed by learned counsel for the petitioners. The respondents vide order dated 19.02.2021 rejected the said application of the petitioners. Subsequently, the respondents proceeded to issue an e-auction notification on 03.03.2021 and also initiated the process for allotment of the plots of Punayata Industrial Area by way of auction.

6.1. This Court further observes that the list of the documents as mentioned in the advertisement in question, were as follows:

1. जिस कृषि भूमि पर उद्योग स्थापित था उसके खसरा नं. की जमाबंदी की नकल एवं यदि नगरपालिका द्वारा आवंटित भूमि पर स्थापित था तो नगरपालिका का भूखण्ड आवंटन का प्रमाण पत्र।
2. वर्ष 2004 से पूर्व के विद्युत कनेक्शन बिल, विद्युत संबंध एवं उत्पादन के अन्य दस्तावेजों प्रमाण।
3. आवेदनकर्ता द्वारा पूर्व में स्थापित औद्योगिक इकाई को कृषि भूमि/नगर पानिका की भूमि से हटाया जा चुका है इस आशय का शपथ पत्र (लघुये 10/- के नॉन ज्यूडिशियल स्टाम्प पेपर पर नोटेरी से सत्यापित)

4. यदि किसी किरायेदार द्वारा औद्योगिक भूखण्ड के आवंटन हेतु आवेदन पत्र प्रस्तुत करना होगा कि भूमि स्वामी को औद्योगिक क्षेत्र पुनायता में भूखण्ड की आवश्यकता नहीं है और ना ही पूर्व में प्राप्त किया है और ना ही भविष्य में मांग करेगा।"

6.2. This Court also observes that in some of the petitions, the petitioners do not have non-domestic electricity connection, even in some of the cases where domestic electricity bill was produced, the same pertained to the period after 2004, and thus, do not fall under the criteria lay down in the advertisement in question. This Court further observes that in some of the cases, handwritten electricity bills were produced, which were not authentic and reliable.

6.3. This Court further observes that in some of the cases, the industrial plots in question were already allotted to the tenants by the Allotment Committee, after due review of the applications, and now the landlord, cannot demand for dual allotments, as the same is not permissible under the law.

6.4. This Court also observes that the list of documents mentioned in the advertisement in question was mandatory to be complied with and each and every documents mentioned in the advertisement in question required to be submitted for consideration of the case for allotment of the industrial plots in question.

6.5. This Court also observes that all the documents mentioned in the advertisement in question were necessary to be submitted and the same was also held by a Coordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court in case of ***Vinayak Febtax Vs RIICO Ltd. Anr (S.B.Civil***

Writ Petition No. 769/2010, Other Connected Matter,

decided on 25.03.2019), relevant portion whereof is reproduced as hereunder:

"The writ petitions are disposed of with the following directions:-

1. The petitioners are directed to file fresh applications alongwith all necessary documents to prove their eligibility for their respective claim seeking allotment of an industrial plot and deposit the requisite charges on or before 15.05.2019.

4. While adjudging the entitlement of the applicants, the Allotment Committee shall act strictly in accordance with law and shall take into account the following factors:

i. Preferably the name of the industry is included/shown in any of the survey lists prepared by the State Authorities including the list prepared by the District Industries Centre, Pali.

ii. The applicant has submitted the relevant documents as required in the advertisement issued by the RIICO for making allotment of industrial plot.

iii. The applicant has produced the documentary proof showing the existence and functioning of the industry prior to passing of the judgment of this Court in the year 2004."

6.6. This Court further observes that after a perusal of the material produced in each of the cases by the petitioners as well as the respondents, it becomes crystal clear that not a single petitioner has submitted the complete requisite documents, strictly as per the advertisement in question, and thus, they were rightly declared as ineligible for allotment of the industrial plots in question.

6.7. This Court also observes that the Allotment Committee, comprising, amongst others, the various officers from the

Government Departments, have made due consideration and review of the documents so submitted by the petitioners, prior to passing of the impugned orders, and thus, this Court is completely satisfied that is nothing on record, which could show any arbitrariness or illegality in the impugned action of the respondents.

6.8. This Court further observes that the Survey was conducted by the concerned municipal body, whereafter, the Allotment Committee was constituted, which has decided to call the applications along with the aforementioned relevant documents of all the industrial units, whose names were shown in the survey list, for due consideration, examination and review.

6.9. This Court also observes that the advertisement dated 09.12.2011 has been issued whereby the applications were invited from the individual industrial units, whose names were not mentioned in the survey list; in pursuance of the said advertisement, 132 applications were received by the respondents and thereafter the said applications were rejected by the respondent vide the impugned communication.

6.10. This Court further observes that firstly, the Allotment Committee issued advertisement dated 14.10.2010 for inviting applications along with relevant documents for allotment of the industrial plots in question and thereafter, again issued the advertisement dated 01.11.2011 in the local newspaper; yet thereafter, the applications along with relevant documents were invited from the industrial units, whose names were included in

the survey list, but then under some misconception an advertisement dated 09.12.2011 has been issued, whereby the application were invited from the industrial units, whose names were not included in the survey list.

6.11. This Court also observes that the advertisement dated 09.12.2011 was quashed on 08.06.2015, in the Committee meeting held under the Chairmanship of Minister of Industries, Jaipur, Principal Secretary, Industries & MD, RIICO, District Collector, Barmer and other officers, while stating that the names of the industries mentioned therein did not figure in the survey list, and therefore, cannot be considered for allotment of the industrial plots in question.

6.12. This Court further observes that the precondition for consideration for allotment of the industrial plots in question, was that the name of the industries must figure in the survey list, prepared in pursuance of the conducted by the concerned municipal body; but since the said condition was not fulfilled in case of the petitioners, therefore, their applications for the allotment in question stood rejected.

6.13. This Court also observes that the survey by the concerned municipal body was the important component for the purpose of shifting of the industries in question, and that, for consideration for allotment of the industrial plots in question, the concerned industries must have their existence in the non-conforming areas; therefore, due since such pre-condition was not duly fulfilled by the petitioners herein, which resulted into non-inclusion of their

names in the survey list in question, therefore, the impugned action of the respondents is justified in law.

6.14. This Court further observes that the advertisement dated 09.12.2011 was not under consideration as the same was rejected/returned in meeting dated 08.06.2015 by the Committee, which comprised of members of higher posts, from various Government Departments, and therefore it cannot be said that any arbitrary and illegal action was taken by the said Committee.

7. Thus, in light of the aforesaid observations and looking into the factual matrix of the present case, this Court does not find it a fit case so as to grant any relief to the petitioners in the present petitions.

8. Consequently, the present petitions are dismissed. All pending applications stand disposed of.

(DR.PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATTI), J.

SKant/-