



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

**CWP-917-2025**

**Date of decision : 28.07.2025**

**Estate Officer-1, Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran,  
HUDA Office, Gurugram**

**...Appellant**

**Vs.**

**The Additional Chief Secretary to Govt.Haryana  
Town and Country Planning Dept.Chd and others**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Harmanjot Singh Gill, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J.(Oral)**

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 10.12.2019 passed by respondent No.2 to the extent that it has directed the date of offer of possession to be treated as 2003 instead of 1996.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as the offer of possession was itself made in the year 1996 and therefore, it was this date which should be considered for determining the extension fees.

3. Heard.

4. It is stated that respondent No.3 had applied for allotment of residential plot in the year 1986. The allotment of residential plot was made on 14.06.1996. The offer of possession was made to her on the same date i.e. 14.06.1996. However, the respondent No.2 had issued another communication,

whereby the offer of possession was made on 08.08.2003. In the impugned order, it has been noticed that as the offer of possession had been made on 08.08.2003, therefore, that date would be considered for determining the extension fee. The respondent No.3 is stated to be the original allottee of the residential plot and the order of Principal Secretary, whereby the date of offer of possession is determined as 08.08.2003 does not suffer from any illegality. The comments of the Estate Officer in this regard, have also been noticed by the Principal Secretary in the impugned order.

5. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that disciplinary action had been initiated against the Estate Officer for issuing the communication dated 08.08.2003, but he is not in a position to inform us about the outcome of those proceedings.

6. Be that as it may, we do not find any manifest illegality in the impugned order determining the date of offer of possession as 08.08.2003.

7. Consequently, the writ petition stands dismissed.

8. All pending miscellaneous application(s) shall also stand disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL )  
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)  
JUDGE

28.07.2025  
vanita

|                             |     |    |
|-----------------------------|-----|----|
| Whether speaking/reasoned : | Yes | No |
| Whether Reportable :        | Yes | No |