



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(111)

CWP-24075-2026

Date of Decision: - 07.08.2026

Deepak Malik and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Arav Gupta, Advocate, and
Ms. Ashmeet K. Shah, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. In the present writ petition, the following prayers have been made in the headnote: -

“CIVIL WRIT PETITION under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of writ, order or direction especially in the form of Writ of Mandamus directing the official respondents to ensure that the development in Village Umri, Sector 33, Kurukshetra is in strict conformity with the Development Plan 2025 dated 25.11.2008 (Annexure P-4) and the Notification dated 25.11.2008 (Annexure P-6) issued under Section 5(7) of the Punjab Scheduled Roads and Controlled Areas Regulation of Unregulated Development Act, 1963, which is a statutory instrument that binds the land usage and any deviation from said usage cannot be made by way of administrative notings/administrative approvals as held by the Hon'ble Supreme



Court of India in Harbinder Singh Sekhon and Others vs State of Punjab and Others, SLP No. 8316/2024 decided on 13.02.2026.

AND

*for issuance of a writ in the nature of Writ of Certiorari quashing Detail Notice Inviting Tender dated 12.2025, Annexure P-2 and all consequent actions thereto, whereby the official respondents intend to change the purpose of land acquired vide Award dated 28.10.2005 (Annexure P-1) i.e. from development of a 'Transport Nagar' to the construction of "Guru Ravidass Bhawan and Museum" (Annexure P-2), as ultra vires Section 99 of the RFCTLARR Act 2013 and Development Plan 2025 dated 25.11.2008 (Annexure P-4) and the Notification dated 25.11.2008 (Annexure P-6) issued under Section 5(7) of the Punjab Scheduled Roads and Controlled Areas Regulation of Unregulated Development Act, 1963, which is a statutory instrument that binds the land usage and any deviation from said usage cannot be made by way of administrative notings/administrative approvals as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Harbinder Singh Sekhon and Others vs State of Punjab and Others, SLP No. 8316/2024 decided on 13.02.2026.***

AND

issuance of any other writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in the present case, as per the Development plan of 2025, which was notified for Kurukshetra, the land in question was reserved for activities defined under Sub-Code 420, 430, 450, 460 and 470 for “Roads, Road Transport Depots and Parking Areas”, “Dockyards, Jetties”, “Telegraph offices, Telephone Exchanges etc”, “Broadcasting Station”, “Television Station”.

It is further submitted that in spite of the same, without making any



amendment in the Development plan in accordance with law, the respondent authorities are raising construction of a religious museum at an estimated cost of Rs.89.94 crores and have issued the tender regarding the same. It is further submitted that the said religious museum would fall under Sub-Code 620 & 640 and would not fall within the sub-codes for which the land in question is reserved. It is thus stated that the said act of the respondents is in violation of the Development plan 2025. It is further submitted that there are other submissions also to challenge the act of the respondents.

3. Learned State counsel, after having obtained instructions from Mr.Chander Shekhar Khare, Chief Administrator, HSVP, has submitted that the exercise of amending the Development plan in accordance with law, is under process and has further fairly submitted that since, till date the same has not been finalized, thus, they would not proceed with the construction of the religious museum. It is further submitted that in view of the same, the present writ petition be disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. It is further submitted that the present order should not come in the way of the respondents in amending the development plan in accordance with law.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that since, at this stage the respondents have made a statement that no construction would be done, thus, the present writ petition be disposed of, but liberty be granted to the petitioners to file a subsequent petition, in case any cause arises/survives with respect to all the aspects raised.



5. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances and in view of the statement made on behalf of the respondents-State, the present writ petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. The respondents-State would be bound by the statement made before this Court. Liberty as sought by the petitioners is also granted.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

August 07, 2026
naresh.k

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes
Whether reportable?	No