

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-21855-2015

Date of Decision: January 12, 2017

Paramjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA**

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | To be referred to the Reporters or not? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? | Yes/No. |
| 3. | Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? | Yes/No |

.....

Present: Mr.Dinesh Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.S.P.Garg, Advocate
for respondent Nos.2 to 4.

.....

SURYA KANT, J.

The petitioner was allotted HIG H.No.993, Sector 70, SAS Nagar, Mohali. He is said to have constructed a room in the rear court-yard of the house and opened a gate through the back wall attracting violation of the sanctioned site plan of the house. These unauthorised constructions led to cancellation of the allotment. The appeal and the revision petition filed by the petitioner were also dismissed.

[2] It appears that there was a policy decision whereunder such like construction can be regularised subject to payment of compounding fee.

Once such fee is paid the construction will stand regularised.

moved by the petitioner but the authorities have not entertained his request on the plea that further revision of policy is yet to be approved by the State Government. Be that as it may, since the respondents have taken a categorical stand that the petitioner is liable to deposit the compounding fee of Rs.3.00 lacs to get the construction regularised, we dispose of this writ petition with a direction that as soon as the petitioner will deposit the compounding fee to be determined by the Estate Officer, GMADA, which may be communicated to him within one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, the compoundable construction said to have been raised by him unauthorisedly shall stand regularised. However, the violation which cannot be compounded shall have to be removed by the petitioner. The petitioner shall deposit the amount within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a notice from GMADA. However, in the event of petitioner's failure to deposit the compounding fee, the authorities would be at liberty to implement the impugned order.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

January 12, 2017
meenuss

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/reasoned ? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable ? | Yes/No |