



\$~87

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

# **CNR No. DLHC010408562026**

+ **W.P.(C) 12650/2026 & CM APPL. 58588/2026**

**RENU DHAYAL**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nikunj Arora and Mr. Paru Garg,  
Advocates.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikrant Pachnanda and Mr.  
Mukul Katyal, Advocates for R-2 to  
R-4.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

**ORDER**

**01.09.2026**

%

1. This is the second round of litigation at the instance of the Petitioner concerning cancellation of the residential accommodation allotted to her at House No. I-108, BBMB Colony, Tyagraj Nagar, New Delhi. In the first round, the Petitioner approached this Court in W.P.(C) 9505/2026 assailing the order dated 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2026 passed by the Housing Allotment Committee[1] of the Bhakra Beas Management Board, whereby the said allotment was cancelled with immediate effect.

2. The Petitioner had submitted a representation dated 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2026 against the aforesaid cancellation, *inter alia*, contending that the order disclosed no reason for the action taken against her. Accordingly, by order dated 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2026, this Court, without entering into the merits of the



controversy, directed the competent authority to consider the Petitioner's representation, after affording her an opportunity of hearing, and pass a reasoned order thereon. Until such consideration, the cancellation order dated 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2026 was kept in abeyance.

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid directions, the Petitioner was afforded a personal hearing on 04<sup>th</sup> August, 2026, following which the impugned speaking order dated 05<sup>th</sup> August, 2026 has been passed, reaffirming the cancellation of the accommodation. Along with the said order, the Petitioner was also furnished copies of the Inquiry Committee Report dated 08<sup>th</sup> June, 2026 and the subsequent recommendation of the HAC, which formed the basis of the original cancellation order.

4. The Petitioner's grievance is that the material forming the basis of the proposed action was not disclosed to her before the personal hearing. It is contended that the reasons now set out in the speaking order, as well as the Inquiry Committee Report and the recommendation of the HAC, were made available to her only after the hearing had concluded. Thus, although a hearing was given, the Petitioner had no real opportunity to respond to the material on which the decision against her was founded. It is further urged that the Inquiry Committee Report itself records divergent views of the residents and, does not support the conclusion ultimately drawn against her.

5. There is merit in the Petitioner's grievance to the limited extent noticed above. The order dated 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2026 did not disclose the reasons for cancellation. Those reasons, together with the material on which they were founded, were disclosed to the Petitioner only upon issuance of the speaking order dated 05<sup>th</sup> August, 2026. If those reasons are to constitute the basis for seeking the Petitioner's eviction, she must necessarily have an



opportunity to respond to them before a final decision is taken.

6. Counsel for the Respondents states that, in these circumstances, the reasons set out in the speaking order dated 05<sup>th</sup> August, 2026 may be treated as the grounds proposed for cancellation of the Petitioner's allotment and that any response submitted by the Petitioner thereto shall be considered by the competent authority in accordance with law.

7. In view of the foregoing, without entering into the merits of the controversy, the present petition is disposed of with the following directions:

i. The reasons set out in the speaking order dated 05<sup>th</sup> August, 2026 shall be treated as the grounds for seeking the Petitioner's eviction from the subject accommodation.

ii. The Petitioner shall be at liberty to submit her response to the said grounds within a period of three weeks.

iii. The response submitted by the Petitioner shall thereafter be considered by the Deputy Secretary/Coordination-cum-Chairman, House Allotment Committee, in accordance with law, and a reasoned decision shall be taken within a period of three weeks thereafter.

8. Until the aforesaid exercise is completed and the decision is communicated to the Petitioner, the operation of the impugned orders dated 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2026 and 05<sup>th</sup> August, 2026 shall remain in abeyance and no coercive steps shall be taken to dispossess the Petitioner from the allotted accommodation. In the event the competent authority decides to reaffirm the cancellation, such decision shall not be given effect to for a period of one week from the date of its communication to the Petitioner.

9. In order to obviate any ambiguity, copies of the complaints referred to in the Inquiry Committee Report shall also be furnished to the Petitioner



within one week from today. The period of three weeks granted to the Petitioner for submitting her response shall commence from the date of receipt of the said complaints.

10. The petition, along with pending application(s), is disposed of in the above terms.

**SANJEEV NARULA, J**

**SEPTEMBER 1, 2026/hc**