



LPA-576-2025 (O&M) 1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**(114) LPA-576-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision : September 17, 2025**

Puran Chand and others .. Appellants

Versus

State of Haryana and others .. Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Sahil Nehra, Advocate, for the appellants.

Ms. Anu Pal, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

CM-1506-LPA-2025

Present application has been filed for impleading legal representatives of the appellant No.2 namely Mukhtiar Devi, who unfortunately died on 17.03.2019.

Notice of the application to the counsel opposite.

Ms. Anu Pal, learned Addl. Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. She raises no objection for the grant of prayer as raised in the present application.

Keeping in view the averments made in the application, which are duly supported by an affidavit, present application is allowed. Legal representatives of appellant No.2 namely Mukhtiar Devi, the details of whom are given in para 3 of the application, are allowed to be impleaded in the present appeal and the amended memo of parties attached with the present application is taken on record only for the purpose of present litigation.



LPA-576-2025 (O&M) 2

CM-1507-LPA-2025

Present application has been filed for condonation of delay of 05 days in re-filing the appeal.

Keeping in view the averments made in the application, which are duly supported by an affidavit, the application is allowed. Delay of 05 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

CM-1508-LPA-2025

As prayed for, the application is allowed.

Annexure A-1 and A-2 are taken on record.

LPA-576-2025 (O&M)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is made to the order dated 05.12.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP 6309 of 1995 whereby the claim of the appellant herein for allotment of land which according to them is in their possession, on the reserved/fixed price is rejected.

2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants argues that Sonku Ram, predecessor-in-interest of the appellants sought the allotment of the land measuring 26 kanals 10 marlas comprised in khasra Nos. 9/4(8-0), 5(8-0), 9(8-0), 6/25(2-10) situated in village Sirasgarh District Ambala on the basis of alleged possession, which was declined to him initially in the year 1982 and thereafter in the year 1994 but thereafter, the same had been allotted in favour of respondents No. 3 and 4 vide order dated 24.05.1994 and 26.05.1994, which is arbitrary and the said fact has not been appreciated by the learned Single Judge in a correct perspective.

3. We have heard learned Senior Counsel for the appellants and have gone through the record with his able assistance.



LPA-576-2025 (O&M) 3

4. It may be noticed that as per the learned Single Judge, in paragraph 10 of the order dated 05.12.2024, it has been mentioned that the allotment of the land in favour of Sonku Ram, predecessor-in-interest of the appellants was declined on 13.12.1982. It is also a conceded fact that the said order is not under challenge. Even the subsequent order qua declining of allotment of land in favour of the predecessor in interest i.e. Sonku Ram is also not under challenge, which is a conceded fact. Only challenge is to the allotment of land in favour of respondents No. 3 and 4.

5. Since, the order declining of allotment of the land in favour of Sonku Ram-predecessor in interest of the appellants, has gone un-challenged hence, the learned Single Judge has rightly appreciated that once the land has been declined to be allotted to Sonku Ram i.e. the predecessor in interest of the appellants has attained finality, the allotment of the said land in favour of the private respondent could not have been challenged.

6. Keeping in view the above, no perversity in the order dated 05.12.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge, is made out so as to need any interference by this Court in the present appeal.

7. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

8. However, this order will not preclude the appellants to avail any appropriate remedy available to them in accordance with law, if any.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

September 17, 2025
harsha

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No