



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

CWP No.3267 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 17.09.2025

RANBIR SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Rajiv Kataria, Advocate, for the petitioner.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has sought cancellation of occupation certificate dated 27.05.2024 (Annexure P-22) issued to private respondent No.6 on the ground that he has violated the building violations. The petitioner is neighbour of respondent No.6 and due to illegal construction raised by respondent No.6, his residential house has suffered structural damage.

2. Issue notice to the respondents.

3. Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate, Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate and Ms. Ashna Singh, Advocate, accept notice on behalf of respondents No.2, 4 & 5 and has filed short reply by way of affidavit of Rakesh Saini, HCS, Estate Office-I, HSVP Gurugram, which is taken on record. They while referring to the reply submit that respondent No.6 has violated the provisions of Article 3 of the Haryana Urban Development Authority (Erection of Building) Regulation 1979. Therefore, the occupation certificate issued to respondent No.6 has been cancelled by order dated 16.07.2025. A copy of said order is at Annexure R-2.



4. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Competent Authority by revoking occupation certificate of respondent No.6 has not taken into consideration the violations pointed out by the petitioner. He further submits that although the occupation certificate issued to respondent No.6 has been cancelled but the concerns raised by the petitioner with regard to the structural damage caused to his house have not been redressed. He would reserve his right to raise this issue in appropriate proceedings, if so advised.

5. Be that as it may, we are of the considered view that after the revocation of occupation certificate of respondent No.6, the grievance of the petitioner appears to have been substantially redressed, at this stage.

6. In view of the above, the petition stands disposed of as infructuous at this stage.

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

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

17.09.2025

sandeep

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No