



CWP-28016-2024

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-28016-2024Date of decision: 18.10.2024

Sulakshna

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Manjot Gujral, Advocate, and
Mr. Gaurav Charaya, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner (Smt. Sulakshna) has prayed for the following
substantive relief:-

*“Civil Writ petition under Article 226/227 of the
Constitution of India for issuance of a writ especially in
the nature of Certiorari for quashing the notice of property
tax bill dated 21.09.2024 (Annexure P-7) showing arrears
and interest thereon prior to the period of allotment of plot
to the petitioner*

AND/OR

*Further issuance of a writ especially in the nature of
Mandamus directing the respondents to clear the pending
property tax for the period prior to the date of allotment of
the plot to the petitioner*

AND/OR

*Further for issuance of a writ especially in the
nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to provide
no dues certificate of the plot purchased in e-auction of*



HSVP so as to get the conveyance deed registered in favour of the petitioner.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner participated in an online public E-auction conducted by the Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran on 11.09.2021. And upon being adjudged H1, she was allotted a clinic site/plot No.2, measuring 250 square meters, Sector 15-1, Sonipat, on free hold basis, vide a letter of allotment dated 09.12.2022 (P-1). Accordingly, the petitioner has since remitted entire sale consideration, i.e. Rs. 2,08,45,000/-. Further, a possession certificate dated 06.03.2024 (P-2), was also issued in her favour. However, he submits that the limited grievance that the petitioner has is: the authorities have served her with a notice dated 21.09.2024 (P-7), vide which, a demand of Rs.4,70,678.61/- has been raised on account of arrears of property tax and interest thereon. He asserts that apparently, the impugned demand notice is erroneous and unsustainable, for, apart from the premium/consideration, all admissible dues have since been deposited. And, in case, there were any pending dues qua the subject site, prior to it having been auctioned (11.09.2021) and allotted to the petitioner, under no circumstances, she could be coerced to pay the same. Thus, this petition.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate, along with Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate, and Ms. Saanvi Singla, is present in Court on behalf of respondents No.2 to 4. At the outset, he submits, for the competent authority is alleged to be in seisin of the matter, it would rather be expedient if the petition is disposed of, at this stage, to enable the respondent authorities to deal with the concerns/grievances of the petitioner and pass necessary orders, in accordance with law. Further, he submits that before any such orders are passed, the petitioner shall be heard, for which a formal communication shall also be issued to her, well in advance.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is in agreement with the course suggested by learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4, and submits that let this petition be disposed of, in terms of the statement



CWP-28016-2024 -3-

made by him. However, it is urged that the authorities be directed to do the needful, within a specified time.

In response, learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4, submits that appropriate orders shall be passed within a period of four weeks from today.

In the wake of the position sketched out above and in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties, the petition is accordingly disposed of.

This Court is sanguine that the authorities shall look into the matter in the right earnest. And the appropriate orders shall be passed within the time indicated by learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4.

Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion on the merits of the case of either party, for, as indicated above, the competent authority shall examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

18.10.2024
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No